





LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS



11
A

John G. Talbot

CHARGE

Dec 1857.

DELIVERED TO THE

CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF ST. DAVID'S,

BY

CONNOP THIRLWALL, D.D.

BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S,

AT HIS SIXTH VISITATION,

OCTOBER, 1857.

PUBLISHED AT THE REQUEST OF THE CLERGY.

With two Appendices:

ON THE DOGMA OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION,

AND

ON THE HISTORY OF THE EUCHARISTIC CONTROVERSY.

LONDON:

RIVINGTONS, WATERLOO PLACE.

1857.

LONDON :
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

A
C H A R G E,

&c.

MY REVEREND BRETHREN,

I cannot address you on this occasion without being reminded of that great change in the state of public affairs which has taken place since our last meeting. The restoration of European peace is an event which affects all interests in the community, even those which are most purely spiritual. For as even these depend in part on material instruments and agencies, they are liable to suffer, more or less, whenever a considerable portion of the national wealth is absorbed by objects which, however important and necessary, are foreign to those interests, especially when the public attention and concern are in the same degree withdrawn from them. We have therefore had reason to be thankful, not only as Christians, for the cessation of one of the sorest evils that afflict mankind,

but also as Churchmen, for the removal of burdens and hindrances which interfered with our proper work. And our thankfulness must be heightened even by the calamitous events which are now passing, when we reflect that it has been through that mercy—little as some of us valued it at the time—that we have been enabled to put forth our undivided strength to meet the danger which threatens our empire in the East. But we have had a motive for still deeper gratitude in that gracious overruling of Divine Providence, by which good was evolved out of evil. The gloomy season of sorrow and anxiety through which we were led, was brightened by glorious examples of heroic charity, which have not passed away with the immediate occasion, but have yielded good and, we trust, lasting fruit, in the upgrowth or improvement of institutions for the mitigation of human suffering, and in the new impulse given to all benevolent exertions for like ends. And while we rejoice at this gain to humanity, we cannot but regard it as a hopeful sign for the diffusion and increase of pure religion, that the termination of the eventful struggle has been commemorated by a monument of pious gratitude in which our Church will be witnessing to the truth of the Gospel in the midst of the unbelievers with whom we were allied for the protection of their political independence, and will at the same time be enabled to hold out the hand of Christian fellowship to the ancient Churches of the East, which, however they may have declined from primitive purity of doctrine

or practice, are not separated from her by any such insurmountable barrier as is raised by the pretensions of the Roman Papacy. And may we not humbly hope—as we ought undoubtedly to pray, and as far as lies in us in our several spheres, to labour—that our present sharp trial may in like manner, but in a far higher degree, be made instrumental for the like salutary ends?

I have glanced at this feature of our late struggle the more gladly, because in so many other quarters the signs of the times appear to me much less cheering with regard to the prospects of the Church. On every side I observe tokens of a spirit which seems to me fraught with mischief and danger, and which no one who has at heart, I do not say the honour and welfare of our Church, but the interests of Christianity, can view without sorrow and uneasiness. I allude to the growing prevalence of dogmatical intolerance, exhibiting itself sometimes in slight offences against charity, which only kindle irritation and heart-burning in particular circles, sometimes in forms which threaten nothing less than a disruption in the Church at large, and which, even if they should not issue in so lamentable a catastrophe, tend to produce a state of chronic discord and ill-feeling. Things in themselves indifferent are made party badges and shibboleths, to which the one side clings the more tenaciously because they are vehemently disliked on the other. Ambiguous terms and practices are studiously selected and brought prominently forward,

because they bear an obnoxious meaning, while by others such a meaning is fastened on the most innocent usages and expressions. The fullest and worst demonstration of this intolerant spirit is an eagerness for the making of new heresies, an endeavour to contract the terms of admission into the Church or its ministry, so as to exclude or disquiet all who do not belong to the favoured party. If such attempts should succeed, it is easy to see the nature, though impossible to measure the extent, of the calamity which would ensue. In the mean time the contests to which they give rise waste the Church's strength, shake the confidence and chill the affections of her most intelligent and attached members, and afford not only matter of exultation and triumph, but real advantage to her adversaries.

All this, indeed, is nothing new. It is no more than has occurred at other periods in the history of our Church. Rather it may be said that there has never been one in which the evil has not been more or less felt. What induces me to notice it now is, that it appears to me to be gaining ground, assuming a more and more threatening aspect, ramifying into a greater multiplicity of hateful forms, infecting the life-blood of the Church with growing virulence, and paralysing healthy action in the same degree that it keeps up a morbid excitement. If such be the case, it is but poor comfort to know that this spirit is not confined to our own communion. There may be others in which it has been far more widely and habitually

dominant. But then we have been used to hear our own Church commended in contrast to them on this very ground. For such a spirit is directly opposed to that *moderation* which has been often and, on the whole, justly claimed as one of her most characteristic qualities. It is true however that the Papal Church has very recently exhibited an instance of such intolerance, which is perhaps, in all its circumstances, without a parallel even in the annals of that Church. And the subject is one which seems to me to deserve our attention, both as holding out an instructive warning, and because it affects the character and constitution of the Church of Rome in a way which ought to be clearly understood.

You are no doubt aware, that within the last three years an event has taken place in that Church, which all sincere Romanists, whatever they may think of it, must regard as of the very highest importance. It is the addition of a new article of faith to those which they had been previously bound to profess: namely, the tenet of the Immaculate Conception, or exemption of the Virgin Mary from all stain of original sin, which was publicly proclaimed at Rome with the utmost solemnity, and announced to all members of the Roman communion, by a Papal Bull, dated the 8th of December, 1854. The doctrine itself has two aspects, the one negative, the other positive. On the one hand, it denies the singularity of that perfect sinlessness, which we, in common with all the reformed confessions, ascribe exclusively to our blessed Lord. On the other

hand, it invests the Virgin Mary with an equal share of this attribute. I am not going to discuss this new dogma from the Protestant—which is the primitive and catholic—point of view, or to repeat the proofs which have been accumulated, not only by Protestant, but by Romanist authors, of its irreconcilable repugnance, not only to Scripture, but to all pure and authentic tradition, as handed down by the most eminent doctors of the Church of Rome itself. Great as is the innovation in doctrine, it is of slight importance in comparison with that which has been effected in the constitution of the Papal Church, by the way in which the dogma has been introduced. New articles of faith have from time to time been added to the Romish creed. But it has been done heretofore by the authority of the Pope in council. The recent addition has been made by the individual Pope, acting on a claim of personal infallibility and absolute power, which though often advanced, and zealously maintained by the ultramontane party, which is now every where in the ascendant, has never yet been established or recognized by any decree of their Church. Accordingly, notwithstanding the prevalence of that party, several members of the Roman communion openly deny that the Pope has power to impose a new article of faith, and contend that his recent act is null and void. A French priest—a man of unimpeached character and orthodoxy, according to the previous Roman standard—was delegated by some of his co-religionists, both clergy and laity, to

protest against the threatened innovation, and had the courage to present such a protest at Rome before the publication of the Bull. But instead of gaining a hearing, he was forced immediately to quit the Papal territory, and has since, I believe, paid the penalty of his honesty and zeal for the truth, in a death of miserable destitution. But he has left an account of the whole transaction, which sheds the clearest light on the character of the proceedings by which the object was accomplished¹. All appear to have been arbitrary, irregular, and illusory. There was an affectation of consulting the bishops, first by an Encyclic Letter², framed in terms of studied equivocation³,

¹ His little work, entitled "Relation et Mémoire des Opposants au nouveau dogme de l'Immaculée Conception, et à la Bulle Ineffabilis, par M. l'Abbé Laborde," has been bought up, and it is now difficult to procure a copy. It is to be wished that it was made more generally known in England, by means of a good translation, as the narrative part is full of curious and instructive particulars.

² Issued from Gaeta, during the Pope's exile, after his flight from Rome in 1848.

³ The inquiry is: "Significare velitis qua *devotione* vester Clerus Populusque fidelis erga Immaculatæ Virginis Conceptionem sit animatus, et quo desiderio flagret ut ejusmodi res ab Apostolica sede decernatur." The fraudulent ambiguity of such an inquiry, when the point to be ascertained was the faith of the Church, is well exposed by Laborde, p. 90. The value of the answers sent to such a question may be partly estimated from what he states at p. 47, that at Rome itself, the mass of the people did not know the meaning of the doctrine. "Le peuple proprement dit, la masse ne comprenait pas même ce qu'on voulait faire. . . . Les femmes et les filles pratiquant la religion, croyaient qu'on allait décider que la sainte Vierge est vierge, et se

and afterwards by an invitation to personal attendance at Rome. But those who assembled there were expressly informed that they were to have no voice in the definition of doctrine, and in fact were only employed to heighten the pomp of the ecclesiastical pageant in the ceremony of the promulgation. The means adopted to enforce the reception of the new dogma, appear to have been worthy of those which were used to silence all opposition, before it was decreed. In France an organized system of persecution, conducted by a so-called religious journal, has been brought to bear on the clergy who showed a disposition to withhold their concurrence⁴. But the general acquiescence in this last strain of the Papal prerogative, though obviously incapable of rendering it one jot the more legitimate, will no doubt practically establish and perpetuate it, and will probably encourage future Popes to emulate its author by fresh, and, if possible, still grosser corruptions of Christianity⁵.

montraient scandalisées que les prêtres ne fussent pas d'accord sur ce point.”

⁴ Laborde, p. 102. “Déjà à Paris des curés ont noté d'hérétiques du haut de la chaire, quiconque ne croit pas au nouveau dogme. Déjà des curés ont refusé à des prêtres de leur laisser dire la messe. Déjà des fidèles se sont vu refuser l'absolution. Dans les départements déjà l'agitation remue tout, et le tocsin du journal (l'Univers) anime le fanatisme.” And p. 67: “Un journal que soudoie dit-on l'argent même de la Propaganda.”

⁵ Cardinal Gousset, Archbishop of Rheims, has published a collection of 665 Letters of Roman Catholic Bishops, partly in answer to the Encyclic of 1849, partly of an earlier date, as part

The point however to which I wish to draw your attention, is quite distinct from this, and wholly independent of the truth or falsehood of the dogma itself, and it is one in which there is no need to rely on any statement, however credible, which might be questioned as proceeding from an adverse partisan. For it rests on the most authentic of all possible evidence, that of the declaratory Bull itself. This is indeed a very remarkable document, as proving, among other things, how much ignorance, misapprehension, and fallacious reasoning may consist with the Papal claim of infallibility, even in the very act of exercising the asserted prerogative. The present occupier of the chair to which this gift is supposed to be annexed, is generally understood to be very moderately versed in theology⁶, and to depend mainly on others for such light as does not come to him in a supernatural way; and the decree to which he has of what he calls a proof of the general and constant belief of the Church in the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception (*La Croyance générale et constante de l'Eglise touchant l'Immaculée Conception de la B. V. M.*), together with the text of the Bull, and other documents. In this very curious volume, all expressions in the letters which attribute infallibility to the Pope are printed in italics, and at p. 758 the Cardinal draws the reader's attention to the fact, that, with the exception of four or five prelates, who seemed to make their full adhesion to the Pope's judgment depend on that of the majority of their colleagues in the episcopate, none called for the convocation of a general council, none thought such a council necessary.

⁶ Laborde, p. 75. "Le Pape actuel passe pour fort peu initié aux sciences théologiques, et pour peu capable de remuer les profondeurs de la tradition."

given the stamp of his authority, was evidently drawn up by one who either did not understand, or studiously misrepresented the question discussed in it. Its object is to justify the new definition by a review of the history of the opinion which it erects into an article of faith. There was indeed a difficulty in the way which it required no little dexterity to evade. Even the Pope has never yet claimed the power of making an entirely new revelation in matters of faith. On the contrary, it is stated in this very Bull, that the Church, as a careful guardian of the doctrines committed to her charge, never changes aught in them, neither diminishes nor adds to them; though she labours with all diligence to elucidate and unfold those which were but imperfectly delineated in her earlier teaching, but always so that they retain their substantial identity of dogmatical import⁷. It was therefore necessary to show that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, which the Bull declares to have been

⁷ "Christi Ecclesia, sedula depositorum apud se dogmatum custos et vindex, nihil in his unquam permutat, nihil minuit, nihil addit, sed omni industria vetera fideliter sapienterque tractando si qua antiquitus informata sunt, et Patrum fides servit (sic f. servat) ita limare expolire studet, ut prisca illa cœlestis doctrinæ dogmata accipiant evidentiam lucem distinctionem, sed retineant plenitudinem, integritatem, proprietatem, ac in suo tantum genere crescant, in eodem scilicet dogmate, eodem sensu, eademque sententia."

A French translation of the Bull is appended to A. Peyrat's little work, "Un nouveau Dogme," which, among other things, contains some well-selected quotations from writers ancient and modern on the subject.

revealed by God, had in fact always been held and believed in the Church. The proof offered in support of this assertion is composed of a string of rhetorical phrases, (without any reference or means of verification,) in which the Fathers have celebrated the purity and sanctity of the Virgin Mary⁸: all as utterly and palpably irrelevant to the point for which they are cited, as the single quotation from Scripture—the angelical salutation—which, except in the mistranslation of the Vulgate, would not even appear to have the remotest bearing on the question⁹.

But though the Pope, relying on such arguments, does not scruple to affirm that the doctrine was always believed in the Church, even he does not pretend that it was believed by all. On the contrary, he traces the history of its progress, and extols the zeal with which the Church, and especially his own “glorious predecessors,” had laboured to propagate it. The numberless passages in the writings of the Fathers, in which it is denied, not only by the clearest implication in the unqualified assertion of the truth which it gainsays, but, as in the famous letter of St. Bernard, by

⁸ Laborde, p. 77. “Si le Pape avait examiné, comme il le fallait, la tradition, jamais il n’aurait laissé s’introduire dans une bulle destinée à tout l’univers cette longue tirade de prétendues expressions des Pères.” And he proceeds to point out their fraudulent irrelevance: many of them, as he observes, relate not to the conception of the Virgin herself, but to that by which she became the mother of our Lord.

⁹ *Gratia plena*. The author of the Bull was perhaps unable to construe *κεχαριτωμένη*. His argument turns entirely on the absolute force of the adjective, which has nothing to answer to it in the original.

express contradiction and elaborate refutation; the long opposition headed by a monastic order which was regarded as the foremost champion of Romish orthodoxy¹—all this is of course passed over in discreet silence. But how far from universal the belief has been down to the latest times, appears clearly on the face of the Bull itself. Toward the end of the fifteenth century, a great step was taken in the propagation of the doctrine by the Papal sanction being given to a festival—that which had been condemned by St. Bernard—in honour of the Immaculate Conception. Still gainsayers were found to deny that the festival was meant to decide the question. And in the seventeenth century, after one Pope had declined to declare the doctrine an article of faith, expressly on the ground that it had not been revealed to the Church, another issued a decree forbidding it to be impugned or questioned. That, after silence had been thus enforced on the one side, the belief should have spread, may be easily supposed. But still it is not pretended that it has yet become universal, and the contrary is a notorious fact.

One thing is certain: that, whether the doctrine is ancient or modern, whether held by many or by few, it had never before been a dogma of the Church

¹ The reader will hardly need to be reminded of the long and hot contest between the Franciscans, the sworn champions, and the Dominicans, the learned antagonists of the Immaculate Conception; or of the scandalous imposture practised at Bern, in 1507, by the Dominicans, the detection of which brought them, and the doctrine which they endeavoured to commend by their pious fraud, into deep discredit.

of Rome. It was reserved for the latter half of the nineteenth century to see that which had previously been no more than a simple belief or opinion, converted into an article of faith. Now for the first time it is promulgated as a truth revealed by God, and all members of the Roman communion are enjoined, not as before, to abstain from disputing it, but to believe it in their hearts, under penalty of making shipwreck of the faith, falling away from the unity of the Church, and so forfeiting all their hopes of salvation. This is the consummation which fills the mouth of its author with joy, and his heart with gratitude. This he considers as the great privilege of his reign. Never, he says, will he cease to render most humble and hearty thanks for the singular favour conferred upon him, of having been permitted to offer and decree this honour, this glory, and praise to the mother of our Lord. Let it then be observed wherein precisely this honour and glory consist. It is in the new peril to which, according to the belief of the Pope himself, human souls—how many, he does not pretend to know—have been exposed by his act. It is, that they who before were safe will be liable to shipwreck; that they who were before within, will find themselves outside the pale of the Church. The danger, the probable perdition of these souls, is the tribute of honour, glory, and praise, which he offers to her whom he describes as the creature nearest to God, and the absolute model of perfect holiness.

And this view of the subject cannot have escaped his notice. It is clearly pointed out in many of the letters sent in answer to his inquiry by his own prelates. One, for instance, an Italian archbishop of his own territory, writes to him expressly for this purpose, stating that for his own part he should rejoice if the doctrine was universally believed, but that he did not see the necessity of making a dogmatical decree on the subject, which might become a stumbling-block to many². But this was the very thing which, according to the Pope's view, would exalt the glory, delight the heart, and propitiate the favour of the holiest of created beings. This is the feature which strikes me as the most characteristic and the most repulsive in the whole transaction. The superstitious credulity in which it had its origin³, the artifices by which it was brought about⁴, the absurdity and groundlessness of the figment itself, may all find a parallel. But, as a triumph of intolerance, achieved by the wanton imperilling of human souls, it seems to me to stand nearly alone,

² Urbino. Gousset, p. 633.

³ One Leonard de St. Maurice, a missionary, was said to have predicted, in the last century, that the definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception would be attended with the termination of all wars throughout the world, the extinction of heresy and schism in the Church, and the exaltation of the Apostolic See. This prophecy appears to have made a deep impression on Pius IX., and, in his exile at Gaeta, he believed that a like revelation had been vouchsafed to himself. See Laborde, p. 76.

⁴ Laborde, pp. 67—69.

and to betray a moral obliquity hardly to be matched in the darkest ages of the mediæval Church⁵.

This is an example which may well lead us to examine ourselves, and reflect what spirit we are of. I see much in what is going on around us, which appears to me to differ rather in form than in substance, rather in degree than in kind, from the proceeding which we have been just reviewing. The Pope naturally places himself at the head of the party in his own Church which is not only the most numerous and powerful, but which labours to exalt his authority. He endeavours to crush the feeble dissentient minority, and to tread out the last spark of religious freedom. He launches his spiritual thunderbolts against those who do not submit their convictions to his decree. He subjects them, as far as he can, to the penalties spiritual and temporal of heresy, and, where his arm cannot reach, he is seconded by a virulent and calumnious journal, which hunts down all who dare to retain the obnoxious truth, or to question the authority by which it is proscribed. All this is no more than was to have been expected in such a quarter. But it is painful to think that there should be any thing corresponding to it among ourselves. Yet, after making due allowance for difference of circumstances, I cannot help seeing much that essentially resembles it in the spectacle which has been presented of late by our own unhappy divisions. For

⁵ Some farther remarks and illustrations will be found in the Appendix A.

there too is a contest in which the parties are both in turn calling in the aid of the secular arm against one another, and endeavouring to establish their respective opinions and tastes as the exclusive standard of faith and practice in the Church. Even the so-called religious journal has its counterpart here.

There is, no doubt, a wide difference in the relative importance of the subjects to which these contentions relate; but not so much in that of the points on which they turn, and still less in the spirit which they exhibit. It is the same temper which finds or makes matter of fierce dispute and ruinous litigation in the minutest details of ecclesiastical ornaments, and in the doctrine of the Eucharist; though, no doubt, a right view of the doctrine, even in points not essential, is far more important than a wise rule as to the furniture of the sanctuary. On the proceedings and the judgment which have determined the degree of liberty to be henceforward allowed in the decoration of chancels and communion tables, I see no need, and feel no temptation to speak, except to express my regret that the question should have arisen, and my acquiescence in the decision by which it seems for the present to have been set at rest. The other case to which I have alluded, might invite some observations on the character of the proceedings which have taken place in it; but I abstain from all comments on this part of the subject, as they could answer no purpose, but possibly to irritate the very temper which I deplore. But the occasion seems to call for some remarks on

the controversy itself. It is true that it has not, so far as I know, in any way agitated any part of this diocese; but I am not on that account at liberty to presume, connected as it is with our most solemn ministrations, that it can be viewed by any of us with indifference, or that there may not be some among us who have been perplexed by it, and may derive benefit from a correct appreciation of its import. And I believe that I shall be best preparing the way for this, if I begin with a brief statement of the points on which both sides appear to agree.

It is admitted on all hands, that the reception of the consecrated elements in the Lord's Supper, is in the nature of means to an end. And as to the end itself, however variously it may be described, there is no dispute among those who profess to hold the doctrine of our Church. All fully assent to the statements contained in her Communion Office, as to the nature of the benefit enjoyed by those who "with a true, penitent heart, and lively faith, receive that holy Sacrament," as consisting in that spiritual union with Christ, which is expressed in the words, mainly borrowed from the language of Scripture, "then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood; then we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us; we are one with Christ, and Christ with us." It is no less concordantly admitted on both sides, that the benefit entirely depends on a worthy reception, and that to an unworthy receiver the Sacrament conveys not benefit, but hurt. It is likewise held by all, that

whatever also may be the effect of consecration on the bread and wine, it produces no change in their physical substance or qualities. On the other hand, none deny that it produces a relative change in them; as, indeed, it is a merely identical proposition to affirm that the consecrated elements do not remain unconsecrated. Nor again is it disputed on either side, that this change, whatever may be its nature, is precisely the same as that which passed upon the bread and cup at the institution of the Lord's Supper, or consequently, that in some sense, they become, after consecration, the Body and Blood of Christ.

It might well be thought that this simple outline of common doctrine afforded ample room both for pious sentiment and for practical exhortation. And, I believe, it would not be easy to point out any topic connected with it, that could serve to the use of edifying, not comprehended within this range. Only as an arena for controversy, it is not large enough, and must be dilated by speculation on questions which lie outside of it.

In primitive times, and wherever religious feeling was pure and strong, the devout communicant naturally identified the instrument with the object to which it ministered. He thought not of the material elements, but was lost in the contemplation of that which they represented to his inward gaze. It was only as faith was darkened, and love waxed cold, that the nature of the instrument itself, apart from its use, could become matter for speculation and controversy. But

in process of time, the language in which the rapturous devotion of the earlier period had found an appropriate utterance, came to be stereotyped into dogmas, and used to fetter all freedom of thought, and to stifle the very feeling which it was originally meant to express. In the same degree as the instrument was really more and more dishonoured by misuse, and so failed to accomplish the object for which it was designed, was it invested with more of outward splendour, which served to divert attention from that object. An efficacy was attributed to the consecration, by which it transmuted the material elements into a different substance, which, from its association with the person of Christ, might become a proper object of adoration, and was not inconsistently believed to possess a virtue which no unworthiness on the part of the receiver could destroy, and which operated like a charm, independently of all internal dispositions which he might bring to meet it⁶. This was the source of some of the grossest and most noxious superstitions into which the Latin Church had sunk before the Reformation, while it ministered, more perhaps than any other cause, to the influence of those who profited by the popular ignorance and credulity. This was therefore one of the main points in the Protestant controversy with the Church of Rome. The Reformers applied themselves in various ways to

⁶ In the eighth century, a statute of Archbishop Boniface of Mayence (in D'Achery's *Spic.* i. p. 508, ed. 2) declares: "Non licet mortuis Eucharistiam tradi."

bring out that part of the truth which had been so lamentably obscured by the Romish doctrine, and especially by the consequences which naturally flowed from the metaphysical figment of Transubstantiation, which had been imposed, as an article of faith, in the twilight of the thirteenth century, by the same Pope who proclaimed the ferocious crusade against the Albigenses. It is not surprising, it would have been had the case been otherwise, that some of those who were engaged on the Protestant side of this controversy, while they held fast the neglected portion of the truth, should have overlooked that which lay behind the false position of their adversaries. We have the more reason to rejoice and be thankful, that our own Church steered clear of both extremes, and retained the whole of the revealed truth without any human additions. On the one hand, she honours the instrument as one of Divine institution, and in proportion to the great purpose which it was appointed to serve, but only as an instrument, in its proper place and degree, of subordination to that purpose. She does not proscribe, but rather seeks to cherish, that devotional fervour, which identifies it in the pious mind with the thing which it represents; but in her theological definitions she has been careful not to confound them with one another. On the other hand, she is no less decidedly opposed to such a view of this Sacrament as would empty it of all special value, and reduce it to a mere act of devotion, differing from others only in the outward form, which would thus

become a bare rite, essentially of the same kind with those of the ceremonial law which were abolished by the Gospel.

It has indeed been made matter of complaint against her, that her language on this subject is not sufficiently explicit and definite: that it lends itself to views and systems which diverge very widely from one another. I fully admit the fact. It is the very thing which, as I conceive, ought to be regarded by every member of her communion as a motive for joy and thankfulness. For it proves that, with respect to this important article of belief and practice, she stands on the same ground as was occupied for more than a thousand years by the universal Church of Christ. During the whole of that period there was no greater uniformity of opinion than now exists among those who differ most from one another in the interpretation of her formularies. Each of the opposite tendencies, the mystical and the spiritual⁷, which are now characteristic of conflicting parties within her pale, then also had their representatives, in writers of unquestioned orthodoxy, who now serve to give a fair show of authority to both sides: and it often happens that the same writer is so little consistent in his statements, that he may be cited in favour of either view. It was only in the ninth century, that literary

⁷ By the *mystical*, I mean that which seems to confound the properties of body and spirit: by the *spiritual*, that which keeps them strictly separate from one another.

controversy for the first time arose on the subject⁸, and then it was carried on freely until the eleventh, when the doctrine most favourable to the grossest popular superstition was first established in its ascendancy by brute force⁹; and it was only in the thirteenth century that it was formally exalted into an article of faith. I must own that it appears to me any thing rather than matter for shame or regret, if the Church of England allows nearly as large a liberty of speculation on this mystery, as was enjoyed and exercised for so long a period, including the primitive times, in the whole Catholic Church.

The dispute on the doctrine of the Eucharist which has lately agitated the Church, has been treated on both sides as one of momentous import. On the one hand we have heard complaints that “a vital doctrine of the Church of England” has been impeached, that an attempt has been made to silence catholic teaching with regard to it, and “to inflict a public penalty on a clergyman, because he holds and teaches the primitive and catholic doctrine of the sacraments wholly apart from the additions and omissions of the Church of Rome¹ :” and that “the faith of a vast number of

⁸ This has lately been denied by Mr. Freeman (Principles of Divine Service, Introd. to Part II. p. 36 foll.). As it is a point which very nearly involves the essence of the whole controversy, I have examined Mr. Freeman’s statements in the Appendix B.

⁹ *Gladiis et fustibus*, as Berengar frequently complains. See especially pp. 52, 53.

¹ Archdeacon Denison, Preface to Sermon III., on the Real Presence, p. 147.

her priests and people is at stake²." On the other hand it has been alleged, that a main principle of the Reformation has been placed in jeopardy by the teaching against which legal proceedings were instituted: that an error, against which our martyrs contended to the death, has been openly maintained under a slightly modified form by persons occupying a high position in the Church, and therefore that it became a duty to resort to the means provided by the law for the vindication of the outraged truth. After the closest attention which I could give to the subject, I am unable to go this length with either party, and have been led to the conclusion that the dispute, though undoubtedly indicating a wide discrepancy of views and feelings, is in itself mainly a verbal one, which would either never have arisen, or have been easily settled, if there had been an earnest desire for mutual understanding, instead of a disposition to widen the breach.

As to the doctrine indeed which has been brought forward under the imposing title of "catholic teaching," understood in the sense attached to it by its opponents, my own opinion is very clear and decided. I am convinced that it is completely at variance with the mind of the Church of England, as expounded by her Articles, Liturgy, and Catechism; and when a ques-

² "Considerations on the Opinion of the Court at Bath," &c., by the Rev. C. S. Grueber, an advocate who caricatures the sophistry which is so unhappily conspicuous in the writings which he defends, but superadds an exuberance of vituperative virulence, from which they are free.

tion of orthodoxy is raised within the Church, it is, as I conceive, only by an appeal to her own exposition of her doctrine in her authentic formularies, and not to any other standard, that the question can consistently be tried. I believe however that the so-called catholic teaching, understood as I have said, is no less repugnant both to Scripture and to the whole stream of genuine primitive tradition, though, by means of compilations which are bringing the name of a *catena* into suspicion and disrepute, as equivalent to an engine of polemical delusion, it may be made to appear to have a great mass of patristic evidence in its favour³. I believe that in itself it involves very nearly as many absurdities and contradictions as that of Transubstantiation, from which it differs rather metaphysically than theologically. But every man has a right, especially when he is on his trial, to explain his own opinions, and to require that they should be judged according to his own interpretation of them, and not by the construction which may be put upon them by his adversaries. It may be that his explanation is perplexed and obscure: it may involve manifest absurdity and contradiction: it may resolve itself into mere nonsense. But these are things for which, as I conceive, the author is fairly

³ A very large part of the passages collected by Dr. Pusey, in his Notes on his Sermon, "The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist," would be deprived of all, even seeming, relevancy and argumentative value, by the simple insertion of the word *sacramental* or *sacramentally*.

amenable to the bar of literary criticism, not to a tribunal which inflicts penalties affecting civil rights. To sustain a charge of unsound doctrine, involving such penal consequences, nothing, as it appears to me, ought to suffice, but the most direct unequivocal statements, asserting that which the Church denies, or denying that which she asserts.

Now in the present case there is peculiar danger of misapprehension and confusion, arising not only from the difficulty and mysteriousness of the subject, but from the ambiguity of the principal terms employed in the controversy. And I think it will be evident that such confusion has actually occurred, if we compare the propositions which were judicially condemned by the Declaration of the Court at Bath, with that which it laid down as the "true and legal exposition" of the Articles which the defendant was charged with impugning. One of the condemned propositions, as cited in the Declaration, runs thus: "That the Body and Blood of Christ, being really present after an immaterial and spiritual manner in the consecrated bread and wine, are therein and thereby given to all and are received by all who come to the Lord's table." It has been made matter of, I think, just complaint, that this statement omits a capital and integral part of the doctrine which it professes to describe: namely, the opposite results of worthy and unworthy receiving, the distinct assertion that the receiving of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper by those receiving unworthily is "unto condemnation," and the

equally distinct denial, "that the holy sacraments save 'ex opere operato,' i. e. by the mere act of receiving." How far this omission may have been justified by any technical rules, I am not competent to say. But I am quite sure that it is absolutely necessary to take into account the part of the doctrine which the Declaration keeps out of sight, in order to appreciate correctly the part which it condemns: and that if truth, not victory, is the object in view, we must place the whole by the side of that which is declared by the Court to be the true and legal exposition of Articles 28 and 29. This exposition stated, "That the Body and Blood of Christ are taken and received by the worthy receivers only, who, in taking and receiving the same by faith, do spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ, and drink His Blood; whilst the wicked and unworthy, by eating the bread and drinking the wine, without faith, do not in any wise eat, take, or receive, the Body and Blood of Christ, being devoid of faith, whereby only the Body and Blood of Christ can be eaten, taken, and received." We have then to consider whether these two statements are really repugnant to one another. And it is clear that they cannot really contradict each other unless they relate to the same thing; and whether they do so or not, must depend on the sense given to the terms, Body and Blood of Christ. But in the defendant's proposition, the Body and Blood of Christ are manifestly the sacramental Body and Blood, that which the bread and wine become after consecration: and that this sacramental Body and Blood are given

to all, and taken and received by all, worthy and unworthy, is what no one denies. But in the "true and legal exposition," the same words evidently mean not the sacramental Body and Blood, but something else, the reception of which involves that participation of Christ, which, in accordance with the 29th Article, the defendant's proposition, when fully and fairly stated, expressly denies to be enjoyed by those who receive unworthily. To this indeed it may be objected, that in that proposition the Body and Blood of Christ are distinguished from the consecrated bread and wine, in which nevertheless they are affirmed to be really present. And if nothing had been added to qualify the sense of the proposition, it would indeed be hard to reconcile it with the 29th Article. But it is qualified by the words, "after an immaterial and spiritual manner," and the author, when he is brought into court on a charge of heresy, is, I conceive, entitled to the full benefit of this addition. If it renders the proposition ambiguous, contradictory, and unmeaning, this, which would be a ground for censure in another point of view, is just that which may be fairly allowed to protect the author from the legal penalties of false teaching. For thus it appears that he holds with the Church, not only that no change takes place by virtue of the consecration in the natural substance of the bread and wine, but also that no other material substance is thereby added to it. What he himself may understand by matter "present in an immaterial manner," a phrase which seems to amount to as much

as a present absence, or a presence after an absent manner, or any other contradiction in terms, it would be useless to inquire, as he very prudently abstains from all attempts at defining it, and treats the presence of which he speaks as an ineffable mystery. In fact he asserts nothing as to the mode in which the sacramental Body and Blood differ from the unconsecrated bread and wine, except that it is immaterial and spiritual. And this is a description quite consistent with the notion of a merely relative change: that is, one by which the elements have become an instrument for conveying that blessing of which the worthy receivers alone partake. A self-contradictory proposition is in itself a mere nullity, and it seems arbitrary and unfair to select a part of it for condemnation, and to ignore another part which neutralizes the offensive meaning. If either is to be taken apart from the other, it should—in a Court of Discipline—be that which bears an orthodox or innocent sense.

A somewhat more intricate question arises on the other proposition condemned by the Court, in which it is affirmed that “worship is due to the real, though invisible and supernatural, presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the holy Eucharist under the form of bread and wine.” There can be no doubt that the terms of this proposition have been selected, whether studiously or unconsciously, so as to exhibit the closest approximation to Romish doctrine. For they are the very terms which might be used by a Romanist divine to express the practical inference to which he is led

by his tenet of Transubstantiation: the adoration of the Sacrament. The "form of bread and wine" is that which he believes to remain in the consecrated elements after the substance has been withdrawn, and the Body and Blood of Christ have been substituted for it⁴. But the question is not now as to the judgment shown in the selection of the terms, but as to their meaning in the defendant's proposition, and this can only be determined by reference to the other parts of his own teaching, not to a system which he professes to reject. And when all is taken together, it is not very easy to ascertain what is the object to which he conceives worship to be due.

Nominally it is the Body and Blood of Christ. But by this he cannot be understood to mean any material substance superadded to the bread and wine. For this is, as we have seen, expressly excluded by the term "immaterial" in his other proposition. Nor can he be supposed to claim adoration for any thing pertaining only to Christ's human nature, and separate from his Divinity. For this would be manifest idolatry, from which the Romanist guards himself by his doctrine of concomitance, and which ought not to be imputed to any one by whom it has not been distinctly avowed. It would seem therefore that the

⁴ Lombard, iv. Di. 8. "De Sacramento et re. Sacramentum est invisibilis gratiæ visibilis forma. Forma ergo panis et vini, quæ ibi videtur, est sacramentum, id est, signum sacræ rei; quia præter speciem quam ingerit sensibus, aliquid aliud facit in cogitationem venire. Tenent ergo species vocabula rerum quæ ante fuerunt, scilicet panis et vini."

presence meant can be no other than a purely spiritual presence of Christ Himself, in the entireness of his person, which is, no doubt, in itself a fit object of worship⁵. And such a presence in the Eucharist, has been constantly affirmed by our most eminent divines, and, as far as I know, denied by none.

It may however be contended, that even when this is assumed to be the author's meaning, he still remains exposed to the charge of a very serious error, by the local limits which he appears to assign to this presence, when he describes it as "under the form of bread and wine," though it must be observed that the phrase does not necessarily imply a local circumscription⁶. But this expression is connected with the construction which he puts upon the language of the Catechism, in its general description of a sacrament, as consisting of two parts, "The outward visible sign, and the inward spiritual grace." From this he infers that the outward part and the inward part make up one indivisible whole, not merely as correlative notions, in which sense it is undoubtedly true that a sign implies a thing signified, but actually, so that

⁵ Whether it ought to be adored in the Eucharist, is quite a different question, which is ably discussed by Mr. Freeman, "Principles of Divine Service," Introd. to Part II. sect. xiii.

⁶ Local circumscription ("circumscriptio" or "inclusio localis") is expressly denied by all the Lutheran divines. See Chemnitz, *Fundamenta S.S. Cœnæ*, c. iii.: "Nec quæstio est de locali inclusione corporis Christi in pane;" and Calov., cited by Kahnis, "Die Lehre vom Abendmahle," p. 459, and Schmid, "Die Dogmatik der Evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche," p. 445.

the outward part cannot exist without the inward part; and consequently that in the Eucharist the inward part or thing signified, which is the Body and Blood of Christ, is so inseparably united with the outward part or sign, the bread and wine, that this cannot be received without the other; and, therefore, that worthy and unworthy receivers alike partake of both.

It is indeed saddening and humiliating to think that such an interpretation of the Catechism should not only have been adopted by a person filling a high position in our Church, but should have been taken by him as a main groundwork of his system. I should not perhaps be speaking too strongly, if I said that it is a gross and childish mistake, which could only have been suggested by the ambiguity of the word Sacrament, which is sometimes used for the Sacramental symbol, and sometimes for the Sacramental rite. The former is the proper, the latter the derivative sense. When it is asked, "How many Sacraments has Christ ordained in his Church?" the question, of course, relates to the rite. When the meaning of the word Sacrament is to be explained, the answer shows that the symbol alone can be meant. When again it is asked, "How many parts are there in a Sacrament?" the subsequent applications of the answer to Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord, show, beyond all possibility of doubt, that the question refers to the Sacramental rite; and therefore that the enumeration of the parts which properly belong to the rite, can prove nothing whatever as to the actual con-

nexion between the sign and the thing signified, especially in such a sense as would imply that the thing signified is contained in the sign. But we are not now concerned with the correctness of the author's reasoning, but with the import of his proposition. And the question is, What is that which he holds to be present in the Eucharist, under the form of bread and wine, and to which he asserts worship to be due? If it is Christ Himself, the error would lie, not in the worship claimed for Him, not in the assertion of his spiritual presence in the Eucharist, but in that definition of this presence which seems so to annex it to the consecrated bread and wine, that whoever receives them, receives Christ. This, no doubt, is a proposition, than which it is difficult to conceive one either more absurd and shocking in itself, or more directly repugnant to the doctrine of the Church of England. But for this very reason we should be the more loath to fasten it on any one who disclaims it. And though the defendant "holds and teaches, that the Body and Blood of Christ, the inward part or thing signified of the blessed Sacrament, is given to, and is received, unto condemnation, by the unbelieving communicant," he, in the same breath, declares that he fully and heartily accepts the statement of the 29th Article, that "the wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, in no wise are partakers of Christ."

I do not pretend to be able to reconcile these propositions with one another, or the former, taken by itself, with the teaching of the Articles or the Cate-

chism. But as that which is orthodox is likewise perfectly clear, while that which seems to contradict it is so obscure and ambiguous, that it is very doubtful whether it has any meaning at all, there can be no doubt which of the two we are bound to prefer, when civil rights are at stake, as the true exponent of the author's belief. If the charge had involved no penal consequences, had been brought before the bar of public opinion, and had only affected the author's reputation as a Divine, I have already said enough to intimate what my judgment would have been. The grounds on which alone it seems possible to acquit him of the legal offence, with which he has been charged⁷, would, in the other point of view, constitute a very grave inculpation. It is something worse than trifling in one who is pledged to the formularies of our Church, to use language which not only suggests, but is the very technical expression of a Romish error,

⁷ Whether the Act of the 13 Elizabeth, c. 12, is applicable to the 29th Article, is quite a distinct question, which has been ably discussed in "An Essay on the History of Article XXIX.," by C. A. Swainson, M.A. But Mr. Swainson appears to me to have entirely missed the point of the controversy, when, at p. 56, he states it thus: "It is essential to his view of the Presence in the Eucharist, that the unworthy comer shall *receive* the Body of Christ; it is not essential that he shall *eat* it. The Archdeacon *must hold* that the Presence is removed before the Sacrament is eaten: he denies that it is removed before it is given, before it is received." I am afraid the Archdeacon would not admit that he is bound by this conclusion. He maintains an indiscriminate oral manducation, and only confines the *spiritual* eating to the worthy receiver.

which he nevertheless professes to reject. And it matters little whether he is unable or unwilling to express his ideas otherwise. Some other dignitary of our Church may avow his belief in the Immaculate Conception, and, on the authority of such quotations as are to be found in the Pope's Bull, may maintain it to be primitive and catholic doctrine, and therefore the doctrine of the Church of England. And it is probable that he might hold and teach it with legal impunity, if he will at the same time declare that he fully and heartily accepts the 9th and 15th Articles. But he would certainly lay himself open to severe censure, which would not be mitigated by any attempt that he might make to reconcile those Articles with the new Romish doctrine. The violence with which the language of the Church has been recently wrested to a like purpose, is one of the most painful features in the controversy we have been reviewing. But still it appears to me that the law would be made an instrument of something very like persecution, if a clergyman was to be deprived of his preferment for contradicting the Articles, though he professed, apparently with perfect sincerity, that he holds every doctrine contained in them, because his interpretation is deemed by some strained and erroneous. And I should not be the more reconciled to such an abuse of the law, because it had been provoked by dogmatical intolerance, indicating a like inquisitorial spirit, on the part of the sufferer. I should only lament that a bad example had been followed, instead of being

shunned. An inquisitor becomes doubly mischievous when he is exalted into a martyr to the cause of religious liberty, and appears as an advocate of free discussion. I am against oppression and injustice, on whatever side they are found; but, as they are the natural allies of error, I deprecate them most of all when they are called in as auxiliaries to the side of truth.

And I am bound to add that, under the present circumstances of the Church, an appeal to a judicial tribunal for such a purpose is the more to be deplored, and the less justifiable, because it can lead to no decision which can serve any other end than that of inflicting injury or annoyance on an individual, and must leave the doctrinal question just where it was before. The "exposition" of the 28th and 29th Articles, delivered by the Court at Bath, however "true and legal" it may be, and however respectable the authority from which it proceeds, has not the slightest claim to bind the conscience of any member or minister of our Church, any more than one given by a private theologian; and it seems to assume an exclusive authenticity, to which it has no legitimate title, when it is styled "*the* true and legal exposition," as if every other must be false and illegal.

But there is still another topic connected with this controversy to which I must briefly advert before I quit the subject. The author whose teaching has been condemned would fain represent himself as having been called in question touching the doctrine of

the Real Presence, and as opposed to those who either deny it altogether, or acknowledge it in an incomplete or erroneous sense; and he pleads this latitude of opinion, which has been allowed, as he thinks, to other ministers of the Church of England, as a ground for claiming the liberty of maintaining his own view "as the one truth of the doctrine⁸." It would not seem to follow that, because there is a variety of opinions consistent with the doctrine of the Church, an opinion which differs from all of them must be so too. But it is important to consider how far the doctrine of the Real Presence is involved in this dispute.

The phrase *Real Presence* is foreign to the language of the Church of England, and has been wisely avoided as liable to abuse, and likely to deceive or scandalize the simple and ignorant. No minister of our Church is required formally to assert or deny the doctrine of the Real Presence. But there is a sense in which it may be and constantly has been asserted in perfect consistency with her authentic teaching, and in which it could not be denied without great detriment to the truth. And this sense is in perfect accordance with the language of Scripture, and especially with that of our Lord Himself, both on other occasions and on that which is recorded in the sixth chapter of St. John,

⁸ Preface to Sermon III., on the Real Presence, p. 153. Compare the remarks of Chancellor Martin, at p. 8 of his Preface to his very useful "Extracts from eminent Anglican Divines, on the Real Presence in the Eucharist."

when He was speaking, as some have thought, with direct reference, as almost all admit, in a manner applicable to the Eucharist. When He says, "I am the vine," it may be enough to say that He speaks figuratively. But when He says, "I am the *true* vine," this would be hardly a correct, certainly not an adequate explanation of His meaning. It is not simply as much as to say, "I am like the vine," but, "I am in truth, reality, and effect, that of which the natural vine is only a figure and a shadow. For, by the natural union between the stock and the branches, it represents that far higher and more intimate union which subsists between me and my faithful people." Thus, in this instance, *true* or *real* is contradistinguished from *natural*. So, "My Father giveth you the *true* bread from heaven;" that of which the manna was but a sign: not natural, but spiritual food. So again: "My flesh is meat *indeed*, and my blood is drink *indeed*." It would not be so, if it was fitted to nourish the body, as natural meat and drink. It is so, because it is nourishment for the soul, spiritual meat and drink. And according to the same analogy, the Catechism teaches that "the Body and Blood of Christ are *verily and indeed* taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper:" that is, not figuratively and unsubstantially, as would be the case if they could be received by the mouth, but really and effectually, so as to impart a solid benefit to the soul. And it is in this sense that so many of our most eminent divines have asserted the *real* presence of

Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist: *real*, as possessing a spiritual, life-giving power, for the strengthening and refreshing of the soul, which could not belong to the natural Body and Blood, considered apart from the whole person of Christ. It would be at variance with this analogy, to speak of a *real presence* of any thing merely natural or neutral, and capable of being received unto condemnation. A thing of this kind would want some other real presence to make it effectual for the desired end. As an instrument of a Divine power, the consecrated bread and wine, though utterly powerless in themselves, are quite adequate to the purpose, and cannot require the addition either of any other substance, or even of any mysterious supernatural virtue. And it is no slight objection to the supposition of such an adjunct, that a stupendous miracle would be wrought without any assignable object. Where there is such a real presence, nothing more can be needed to ensure the fulness of the blessing which the Sacrament was designed to convey to all who worthily partake of it. And without such a presence, no preparation could be of any avail. This is a presence which is independent of nearness or distance, and belongs perhaps more properly to time than to space. But with respect to both, we may say that Christ is really present in the Eucharist, that is, in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. And as the consecrated elements are the instrument by which this presence operates in the worthy receiver, it might have been said—inno-

though not wisely—that He is present *under the form of the bread and wine*; and the phrase has been allowed to remain in a notice at the end of the first Book of Homilies. But it cannot now be used either wisely or innocently by a divine of the Church of England, because it is a phrase which must scandalize or mislead, until it is explained; and, when explained according to her doctrine, is found to signify something which would have been more properly expressed in different words.

Such a presence is, in the highest sense of the word, to the full as *real* as that which, in the Romish and Lutheran systems, and apparently according to the view of the author whose propositions have been recently condemned, is held to be lodged in the sacramental symbols, though not so as to render them the more certainly effective for any beneficial operation. It is therefore a mere polemical artifice to allege that one who rejects all those systems is opposed to the doctrine of a real presence in the Eucharist; and I do not know that there is any other ground for the assertion, that there are ministers of our Church who deny it altogether. But I am not sure that all pay sufficient attention, or attach due importance to this part of the truth. And it would not be surprising if many, recoiling with just aversion from the innovations which have been lately attempted in the language, if not in the essential doctrines of the Church on this head, should have fallen into the opposite extreme, and have lost sight of what I will venture to call the

objective reality in the Sacrament. It may be that they hold rightly, that the simple sign is sufficient as the divinely appointed instrument, and a suitable frame of mind in the receiver as the requisite condition, of the benefit to be conveyed; but that they are apt to overlook the necessity for something beside the instrument and the condition, which is more indispensable than either; namely, the Presence, the Power, the spiritual agency, by which the instrument is effectually applied. The practical tendency of this oversight is, to rob the Sacrament of its specific character, to reduce it to a mere form of prayer or mode of preaching; virtually to contradict the teaching of the Church in her Articles, and to divest the language of her Liturgy of all its propriety and significance. It is true that all sacred ordinances have a common end, and that the efficacy of all depends on their common author. But it does not follow that all are of equal dignity or value. And if there is a point on which the witness of Scripture, of the purest ecclesiastical tradition, and of our own Church, is more express and uniform than another, it is the peculiar and transcendent quality of the blessing which this Sacrament both represents and exhibits, and consequently of the Presence by which that blessing is conferred. How this Presence differs from that of which we are assured by our Lord's promise, where two or three are gathered together in His name—whether only in degree or in kind—it is beyond the power of human language to define, and of human thought to conceive. It is a

subject fit, not for curious speculation, but for the exercise of pious meditation and devotional feeling; and it is one in which there is no danger of ever going beyond the mark, but rather a certainty that the highest flight of contemplation will always fall short of the Divine reality.

It is our happiness that the bread which nourishes our bodies, is not the less nutritive to any of us, because he knows nothing either of the processes, natural and artificial, by which it is prepared, or of those by which it is digested and assimilated to the texture of his bodily frame. And we do not withhold it from the hungry, until we have either ascertained their knowledge, or enlightened their ignorance on these points. It is to be lamented, that the case is often far otherwise with regard to our spiritual food: that we suffer ourselves to be diverted from its proper use, by speculations on its nature, and on the mode of its operation, and that we are ready to exclude those who differ from us on such questions from the Table of our common Lord.

The topic on which I have been dwelling is so intimately connected with one which has lately occupied a considerable share of public attention, and has excited much warmth of feeling, that I cannot forbear touching upon it; the rather as it affords another illustration of the spirit to which I adverted at the outset. The points of difference between the Communion Office proper to the Scottish Episcopal Church, and our own, have been urged as reasons for regarding all who prefer the former with suspicion, and for

excluding them from privileges to which they might otherwise have seemed to be fairly entitled. I cannot say that I am at all surprised at the jealousy which has been displayed with regard to those points, but I am convinced not only that it is not justified by the contents of the Scottish Office, but that it was not in fact suggested by them, but, having arisen from other causes, has happened to fall upon it. There is indeed a very considerable difference between the two Offices, both in their structure and their language. But this I cannot consider as an evil in itself, still less as any thing which ought to be a bar to the freest brotherly intercourse between two Churches which so closely agree with one another in doctrine and discipline. Liturgical uniformity is no doubt very desirable within the pale of each Church, though even there it may be too rigidly enforced, or carried too far into details which it would be better to leave to the choice of the several congregations. But in the case of two independent Protestant Churches, a far greater latitude may be perfectly consistent with their essential unity and concord, and may even yield some benefit, especially with regard to that rite which presents such a variety of aspects, that they can hardly be all fully brought out by any human composition. And it is by no means certain that, where the Scottish Communion Office differs from the English, the advantage is always on our side. There are passages in the Scottish Office, which, as it appears to me, add much to its solemnity, without being liable to any misconstruction in point of doctrine. They express that, which in the

English Office is tacitly implied, but is left to be understood, and therefore may easily be overlooked. But the main difference between the two Offices consists in the greater prominence which is given in the Scottish to the commemorative character of the rite. This is indicated, partly by the language used in the form of Consecration, which dwells much more emphatically than our own on the Memorial, and partly by the number of prayers and other acts of devotion which are interposed between the Consecration and the Communion, while in our Office the one follows immediately after the other. This portion of the Scotch service includes the Prayer for the Church militant, the Lord's Prayer, Invitation to the Holy Communion, the General Confession, and Absolution, the hortative sentences of Scripture, and the Prayer for a meet and salutary reception of the consecrated elements. It is clear that in the view of the framers of this Liturgy, the interval between consecration and communion is the most appropriate season for all manner of supplications general and special, which are founded upon the great sacrifice commemorated in the Eucharist. I must own that I do not see any valid doctrinal objection to this view, though I am aware that it may be carried out in a manner liable to great abuse. The structure of the English Office is grounded upon a different, but not a conflicting view of the subject; and it possesses two important practical advantages. One is, that it embodies the truth, which seems to be so clearly signified

by the terms of the original institution, that the reception of the Sacrament is an integral part of the divinely appointed memorial. The other is, that it precludes, as far as possible, all danger of a very serious error, that is, of confounding the eucharistic sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving with the one Oblation once offered, which it commemorates; in other words, that it leaves no room for any approach to the Romish false doctrine of a propitiatory sacrifice in the Eucharist. I think that at the present juncture it would be difficult to overrate the value of these advantages, and that we cannot be too thankful for a Liturgy which bears such clear and decided witness to a main Article of our Protestant faith. But, at the same time, it would, in my opinion, be very unjust to charge the framers of the Scotch Office, or those who make use of it, with the intention either of questioning the truth, or sanctioning the error to which I have just adverted.

An eminent divine of our Church, one of the most learned of my predecessors in this see, Bishop Horsley, did not hesitate to declare that he "thought the Scotch Office more conformable to the primitive models, and in his private judgment more edifying, than that which we now use." And he expressed his belief that "our form of consecration of the elements is sufficient," in a way which clearly intimates his opinion, that it is not more than sufficient, and might have been much more satisfactory. The supposed defect to which he alludes, has been noticed by

many others, divines of unquestioned orthodoxy, some of whom have thought it desirable to supply it in manuals of private devotion. It consists in the omission of the Prayer of Invocation, which in the primitive Church appears to have been regarded as no less essential to the form of consecration than the narrative which recites the words of institution⁹. And it can hardly be denied, that our ritual would lie open to the charge of deviating in an important particular from our Lord's example, and from apostolic usage, as recorded in Scripture, if there was nothing in it to represent that giving of thanks or blessing, by which we find the bread and the cup to have been constantly hallowed before the distribution. But it should be remembered that we know absolutely nothing as to the mode or the terms in which this was done by our

⁹ See Bishop Russell (of Glasgow), Charge, 1845, p. 35. "Most of us agree in the opinion so well expressed by Bishop Horsley, that the holy Sacrament is regularly administered by the common Office, though the doctrine of the Church is not distinctly brought out. By the ignorant and dishonest, the Scottish is said to approach nearer than the other to the canon of the mass. Never was there a greater mistake; for while a Roman Catholic might receive the Sacrament according to the English form, he could not possibly receive it according to the Scottish. In this last, the prayer of invocation is held indispensable, a prayer which an intelligent member of the Church of Rome could not tolerate, because it would imply that the bread and wine, after being transubstantiated, made the very Body and Blood of our Lord, required to be blessed and sanctified." With this may be compared Bishop Mant's "Letter on the Scotch Communion Office," and "A Letter to Bishop Skinner," by the Rev. John Alexander.

Lord or his Apostles; and that, whatever may be the imperfection of our form of consecration, though the recital, which contains the groundwork of the whole ordinance, is treated as the most essential part, still it is in substance and effect a prayer for the same blessing which is implored more formally and expressly in the Scotch form, and that it is preceded by a most solemn ascription of thanks and praise. I cannot therefore subscribe to the opinion, that there is even an apparent material defect in this part of our Office, however I may sympathize with the regret which has been so frequently expressed, that it does not include a more distinct and explicit petition for the Divine blessing on the elements. It is quite another question whether the language of the Scotch prayer may not be open to reasonable objection. And I think it can hardly be denied that it is not free from ambiguity; and that although its meaning may be perfectly consistent with sound doctrine, that meaning might have been more clearly expressed, so as to avoid the danger of even remotely suggesting the error of the corporal presence. This object seems to me to have been best accomplished in the American Liturgy, which retains the Invocation in a form which is effectually guarded against any such misconception. But the same object is also attained in the first Liturgy of Edward VI., by the insertion of two words, which suggest the distinction between the instrument, the material elements, and the spiritual blessing, which it is designed to convey to the worthy receiver. And

it is solely in the omission of these two words, or the substitution of the word "become" for "be unto us," that the Scotch Prayer of Invocation differs from that of the above-mentioned Liturgy. It may be true, that this omission does not necessarily affect the sense; that the context may still bear an orthodox construction; the change indicated by the word "become" be merely relative or sacramental; and, therefore, that the omission may be defended on the ground that "the phrases are," as has been said, "equal in value, theologically and grammatically¹." But if the question was to be argued on the ground of Christian prudence and charity, I think that the difference would not appear so unimportant, and that when one of the phrases is unequivocal, and capable of none but an orthodox sense, while the other is liable to a misconstruction, which may offend or mislead, it cannot be doubted which of the two ought to be preferred. And under certain circumstances, the deliberate retention of a phrase which was originally harmless, may assume the character of an act, intended to maintain the doctrine which the phrase has been supposed to imply². For there seems to be hardly any other motive than the assertion of that which is considered as an important truth, that could justify the refusal of

¹ Bishop Russell, Charge, 1845, note iv. p. 42.

² By persons however who are perhaps not aware that the expression which they prefer is that of the Canon of the Mass, where the words of the prayer before the consecration are, "Ut NOBIS corpus et sanguis fiat dilectissimi filii tui."

such an easy satisfaction to doubting minds and tender consciences, as the insertion, or rather the restoration, of two words in a prayer. But with these qualifications, I cannot wonder, much less regard it as ground for censure or suspicion, that members of the Scotch Episcopal Church should be warmly attached to their own peculiar Liturgy; and I think it neither liberal nor reasonable, that they should be required to surrender it as the price of any advantage which they might derive from a closer outward communion with the Church of England.

The controversy on the Eucharist has followed that which agitated the Church on the Sacrament of Baptism, not simply in order of time, but in the relation of an effect to its cause. It was almost avowedly a counter-movement of a party which resented an advantage that had been gained by its antagonists, and desired to counterbalance it by an equivalent success. One had made good the right of holding an opinion which some wished to have condemned as heretical on the efficacy of Baptism; another therefore would claim the like liberty of teaching what was considered on the opposite side as a pernicious heresy on the nature of the Eucharist. But unhappily—as indeed it was but too easy to foresee—the later controversy, though it has in some measure superseded the earlier one in the hold which it took on public attention, has made no change in the relative position or views of the parties, unless so far as it has served to embitter the spirit of their contest, and to render it more

exclusive and intolerant. Those who had successfully maintained their ground when it was legally threatened, have not been content with this victory, but have been animated by it with the hope of becoming sole masters of the field. A movement appears to have been set on foot for effecting this object by means of what is called a *purification* of the Liturgy, which has been lately recommended in an elaborate work³, written with considerable ability, but not so remarkable on this account, as because there is reason to believe that it represents the views of an active party, which is bent on accomplishing a radical change in the character of the Church. I am not aware that these views had been ever in our day so clearly expressed or so openly avowed. It is, as far as I know, the first time in our memory that a revision of the Liturgy has been proposed, or rather demanded, for the express purpose of adapting it to a peculiar system of doctrine, for which its partisans had hitherto been satisfied with the shelter which it found in the language of our present formularies. And in this point of view the attempt may be regarded as perhaps the most glaring example that has occurred in our own Church of that dogmatical intolerance to which I have been directing your attention. The pretext for this attempt has been furnished by a polemical artifice which is very common, though not on that account

³ "Liturgical Purity, our Rightful Inheritance." By John C. Fisher, M.A., of the Middle Temple.

the more creditable, by which the disputant first affixes his own definition to an ambiguous term, and then charges his opponents with the worst consequences which he can deduce from the meaning which he imputes to them. The author's historical review of the various phases through which our Liturgy, and other Formularies, have passed, before they were brought to their present shape, will perhaps, so far as it is correct, lead others to a very different conclusion, and will inspire a feeling of gratitude for the result which has been worked out through this long conflict of jarring opinions, prejudices, and passions, together with a resolution not to throw away that which has been thus providentially preserved. Of the consequences that would probably ensue from the success of this attempt to the peace and welfare of the Church, I need not speak, as I believe the danger of such an event to be very remote, and I have only adverted to it as an illustration of an evil which is manifesting itself among us in a great variety of forms. The most mischievous effect that there seems room to apprehend from the attempt itself, is the prejudice which it may raise against all proposals for Liturgical changes, though conceived in a widely different spirit, and directed to a wholly distinct object. I trust however that it will only serve as a salutary warning against the principle which it so boldly avows, and will not deter the more liberal and enlightened friends of the Church from persevering in their endeavours to bring about such modifications of her Liturgical usages, as

may adapt them to the altered circumstances and growing needs of our times. It would indeed be surprising if, while all around us has been undergoing such vast and momentous changes, the regulations of public worship continued to be as well suited as ever to their original purposes, and if no inconvenience could now arise from an Act of Uniformity, always of questionable expediency, and passed two centuries ago. There is a strong conviction in many minds, one which has of late been fast gaining ground, and is making itself more and more distinctly audible, that such a supposition would be no less contrary to fact than to antecedent probability, and that it is highly desirable to provide a remedy for the inconvenience which has arisen from the existing incongruity between the state of the law and the wants of the Church⁴. But the most important among the objects which such friends of the Church have in view, might be accomplished without any change in the language of our Formularies, simply by enlarged facilities for a freer use of the contents of the Prayer Book and the Bible. Out of this treasure might be brought "things new and old," which, by means of a judicious selection and arrangement, would amply suffice for the ordinary use of the household of faith. This therefore would seem to be the object which should take precedence of all others in every plan for the improvement of the

⁴ See "The People's Call for a Revision of the Liturgy, in a Letter to Lord Palmerston," by the Rev. James Hildyard, 1857.

Liturgy. It would be effected mainly by some slight alterations in the Rubric and the Calendar. But after this had been done, there would still remain some deficiencies to be supplied, and there might be yet room for a farther revision, which would contribute, though in an inferior degree, to the usefulness of the materials already at our disposal. It might be desirable to provide a greater number of Services for special occasions of regular and frequent occurrence, as well as a greater variety of extraordinary Prayers and Thanksgivings. It would then be time to consider, whether the language of the Prayer Book required or admitted of improvement for purposes as to which, in principle, all would agree, however they might differ from one another in the details of its practical application. For in the abstract none would deny the expediency of removing all needless occasions of offence or mistake arising from an obsolete or ambiguous phraseology.

This subject has already engaged the attention of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, chiefly in connexion with the larger question of a better provision for the spiritual wants of our growing population: and that Convocation has been praised by the author, to whose work I have been referring, for the readiness which it has shown to address itself to this subject, and the desire it has manifested for a revision of the Prayer Book⁵. But I believe that, if there

⁵ See p. 572 and foll.

was a principle on which the Convocation was more unanimous than any other, it was that the first, the indispensable condition on which any such proposals for Liturgical changes could be entertained, was the strictest abstinence from all attempt at dogmatical innovation, and that even the remotest suspicion of an intention to *purify* the Liturgy in the author's sense, would in their judgment have been fatal to any plan by which such an intention was betrayed. But, however little that praise was merited by any apparent conformity to the author's views on the point to which he attaches supreme importance, it is, as coming from such a quarter, highly significant and worthy of notice. It marks a great change in public opinion with regard to Convocation. When I last addressed you, I felt it necessary to point out the groundlessness of any alarm about the mode in which Convocation might exercise whatever powers it possesses, even though unrestricted as to the time allowed for its deliberations. It then seemed to me not superfluous to observe: "Not only has it no independent legislative authority, by which it could encroach upon existing rights, or introduce perilous innovations, but it is liable at any moment to be reduced to silence and inaction." The apprehensions which this remark was designed to allay, had been alleged, in the same quarter from which Convocation has been just receiving this tribute of praise, as a ground for stifling the first signs of its returning life, and keeping it in perpetual silence and inaction. *Now* it is applauded by one

who puts himself in the van of those who were its most violent opponents, because he thinks it is, or hopes it may become, favourable to an encroachment on existing rights, which it deems most sacred, and may serve to introduce innovations which it regards as both perilous and unjustifiable. But now that the fears which were at first held out as reasons for silencing Convocation, have been too generally recognized as idle and visionary, to be any longer available for such a purpose, its adversaries have shifted their ground, and endeavour to represent its proceedings as a mere waste of time, because they have not been attended with any immediate palpable results in a legislative form. As however there would be some difficulty in urging this as a reason for suppressing those proceedings, the fact that this is the strongest objection that is any longer alleged against them, may be considered as affording some security that they will not in future be forcibly interrupted, or compressed within narrower limits. Persons however who watch them with a friendly and enlightened interest, believe that they no more deserve to be denounced as useless, than as dangerous. To such observers they appear to be a necessary preparation for a most important work, in which the welfare of the Church is far more deeply concerned than in any particular legislative enactment: and such persons would regard any attempt at ecclesiastical legislation, even if it were practicable under present circumstances, as premature and mischievous. But they see

room to hope, that out of these consultations, without any direct appeal to secular authority, there may grow that which in time, with God's blessing, may renew the face of the Church, and infuse the vigour of a second youth into all parts of her system. Consider for a moment what we have, and what we want. There is no lack of energy, or of wisdom, or of zeal, or devotedness, though all no doubt capable of increase, in the Church, either among the Clergy or the Laity: there is a superabundance of material wealth in their public and private property; there are manifold advantages attached to their legal and social position. What is wanted is that these various resources should be drawn forth, combined, and applied for a common end. But it is clear, that union of will must precede and prepare the way for unity of action, and such union can only be elicited and expressed by means of conference and free discussion. But it is evident that Convocation, as it is at present constituted, is utterly inadequate to such a purpose; and it is more than doubtful, it is altogether improbable, that its constitution will ever be so modified as to render it a fit instrument for so great a work. It may however be found,—and the thought appears to be growing more and more familiar to those who have most carefully considered the subject,—that Convocation, however useful in its measure, is very far from exhausting the Church's legal capacity for united deliberation on her own concerns; and that a mode might be devised, in perfect harmony with her ancient

institutions, for gathering the sense both of the Clergy and the Laity on questions affecting their common interests and objects, as faithful members of her communion⁶. No doubt many difficulties will have to be overcome, before any such plan can be matured and carried into effect. It will probably be fashioned only by degrees, with the aid of experience, and arrive at whatever success it may attain through many failures and disappointments. But it should be observed, that it will not have to contend—as would be the case with any attempt at a re-construction of Convocation—with difficulties depending on the will of any who are foreign or hostile to the Church, but only with such as may arise from a divergency of views and opinions on secondary points, among those who are perfectly unanimous on the main object, and equally desirous of promoting her interests. It is true that such a representation of the Church, however complete, would be even less capable than Convocation now is of any action that would possess legal force, or exert any other than a purely moral influence. But the weight which its deliberations would carry with them would be in proportion to the completeness of its organization, and its moral influence would probably make itself felt in quarters where the judgment and wishes of Convocation could command no respect or sympathy. The relation in which Convocation would stand to

⁶ See “Convocation and the Laity; a Letter to Archdeacon Grant,” by Francis Henry Dickinson, Esq.

such a representative body, would determine itself according to circumstances which cannot be exactly calculated. But there would be nothing in the new institution either to change the legal character, or to supersede the ordinary functions, of the ancient ecclesiastical synod. In the meanwhile the recent sessions of Convocation have served the important purpose of satisfying every impartial mind, that our party divisions would not be likely to raise any formidable obstacle to the success of such an attempt as I have been indicating, but rather that, in proportion as the basis of the representation is enlarged, prudence and moderation may be expected to preside over the counsels of the Church, and there will be the less danger from the spirit of intolerance and persecution in any direction.

The influence which may be exerted on the Legislature by an expression of the opinions and feelings of any large portion of the Clergy, has been recently illustrated by the important concession which has been made to the conscientious scruples entertained by many of them, with regard to the celebration of marriage in cases where the former marriage of one of the parties had been dissolved on the ground of adultery. I wish that this concession, valuable as it is, had been more ample, and had fully met the scruples of those clergymen who, on grounds which are entitled to the highest respect, even from those who do not entirely assent to them, believe marriage to be absolutely indissoluble. The more extensively

this conviction prevails among the Clergy, the stronger must be its claim on the forbearance of the Legislature. And if it was shared by comparatively few, the danger of inconvenience to individuals seeking for the solemnization of their union under such circumstances, would be proportionately less. I abstain from all discussion of the question itself. Independently of all religious scruples, I cannot help viewing the new facilities given to divorce with strong misgiving; but only because I fear that they may operate injuriously on the domestic interests of society, not because I think that the Legislature has, in this innovation, exceeded its rightful powers, and violated the law of God. I am indeed persuaded that, in a community like the primitive Church, regulated by the pure mind and will of Christ, marriage would invariably be held indissoluble. But I am not equally satisfied that all the precepts which would be binding on such a community, are likewise applicable to one placed in circumstances so widely different as those of our age and nation, or were intended to be universally enforced by legislative authority. I am afraid that, whatever *hardness of heart* warranted a relaxation of their rigour under the Mosaic dispensation, may be found in an equal degree in modern English society: and the question how it may be best treated, is one of prudence rather than of principle. But it seems to me clear, that, however this may be, the Legislature cannot reasonably or consistently require the Clergy, whom it obliges to recognize the Scriptures as of

supreme authority, to act in contravention of that which appears to them to be there plainly taught as the commandment of Christ.

I must now turn to some topics which are more immediately connected with the concerns of our own Diocese. And that which first presents itself, is one which I approach with much pain and reluctance. I had for a time indulged the hope, that I might be spared the necessity of thus publicly adverting to it: but even when I was forced to abandon that hope, I found no reason for anticipating this which seems the most convenient season for that purpose. The subject was first brought under my notice, in a form which called for a practical decision, in the latter part of last year, by a memorial signed by upwards of seventy beneficed clergymen of the Diocese, in which they drew my attention to a volume of Sermons, published by the Vice-Principal of St. David's College⁷; 'both with regard to its teaching generally, and especially to its statements on Holy Scriptures,' which appeared to the subscribers 'seriously to affect the supremacy and infallibility of Scripture as the Divine rule of faith and practice, and to clash with the language of the Articles and Prayer Book on the subject.' They declared that these statements had 'filled them with alarm, and shaken their confidence in the author as a theologian,' and expressed their fear that 'his con-

⁷ "Rational Godliness after the Mind of Christ and the written Voices of His Church," by Rowland Williams, B.D.

tinuance in the office which he holds, would be attended with most serious consequences to the interests of the College and the welfare of the Church in the Principality;’ and therefore ‘prayed me to adopt such steps as I might deem best calculated to meet the emergency, and to restore confidence in the Divinity instruction, which candidates for the ministry of our Church receive at St. David’s College.’

The question thus formally raised, had long before engaged my most earnest attention; but the step by which alone it seemed possible that the confidence, which had been in this respect withdrawn from the College, could be effectually restored, was one which, as I explained in my answer to the memorial, it did not rest with me to adopt. But I must now add that, if my power of dealing with this case had been as ample and absolute as it has been assumed to be by persons unacquainted with its real nature and extent, it would not have been easy for me to reconcile that which might appear to be required for the interests of the College, and the peace of the Diocese, with the respect due to the rights of individuals; rights which, when clear, I could not think it lawful to sacrifice to any object, however otherwise desirable. There are two or three general principles by which I should wish to be governed, whenever I am called upon to exercise any authority with which I am entrusted for the conservation of sound doctrine. On the one hand, I hold myself bound to resist the introduction of all error contrary to the teaching of the Church:

on the other hand, I regard it as a no less sacred and important part of my duty, to respect, and, as far as lies in me, to protect that freedom of thought, word, and action, which the Church has hitherto granted to her ministers and members, and neither to make nor to sanction an attempt to place it under any new restriction which she has not thought fit to impose. I also consider it as a plain rule of equity, that no man shall be held responsible for opinions which he disavows, and that every one shall be allowed to interpret his language in his own sense, and shall not be convicted of heresy—above all when the conviction is to involve penal consequences—on a construction of his words which he does not himself admit.

It was apparently in conformity with this principle, that one who gave instruction in Divinity in the University of Oxford, having published doctrine which seemed to be at variance with the teaching of our Church, was recently required to renew his declaration of belief in her Articles. And it is a fact not without moment, that the sermon which has been considered as especially liable to the charge of false doctrine in the case now before us, was preached before the University of Cambridge, which has since conferred the degree of Doctor of Divinity on the author.

The difficulty to which I alluded, arises partly from the nature of the subject, and partly from the peculiar manner in which the author has treated it. I trust that I shall not be supposed to be speaking disparagingly of his unquestionable ability, if I ven-

ture to doubt whether his doctrinal statements would have attracted much attention, if they had not been forced into notice by the accident of his position. It may be that the fault lies with myself: but I must own that they appear to me singularly deficient in clearness and precision. They are commonly forcible and striking; often pregnant and suggestive: not unfrequently epigrammatic and pungent. But these are qualities which, however attractive, are not always favourable to perspicuity, and, however well suited to the ordinary purposes of a sermon, are not equally so to the treatment of controverted points of dogmatical theology, in which they may leave room painfully to miss that dry, homely, sometimes rather wordy and tedious, but unaffected and unpretending style, to which we are accustomed in the works of English divines, who have handled such subjects, and which, whatever may be its faults, has the merit of conveying, whether in many or few words, neither more nor less than the writer's exact meaning. This deficiency has perhaps operated injuriously on the general impression produced by the work we are now considering, and certainly increases the difficulty of forming a clear judgment upon it.

With regard however to the nature of the questions raised by some portions of it, and to which the memorial expressly refers, there are some distinctions which it is important to keep in view. These questions do not immediately touch any Article of the Christian faith: they relate not to the things them-

selves "which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health;" but to the mode of the communication through which these truths are known and believed. And it is gratifying to reflect that no complaint has reached me, imputing any unsoundness to the author's teaching on any such points. Still it cannot be denied, that in one point of view the questions which concern the communication of the truth may be considered as more important, and as lying nearer to the foundation of the whole, than any part of the truth itself. For the certainty and value of all parts alike depend on the Divine character of the communication; and if that should be rejected, must be greatly impaired, if not utterly ruined. But then this applies only to the Divine origin of the communication; and when that is admitted, the question as to the mode of transmission, though highly interesting and important, becomes one of secondary moment. To individuals indeed, according to the view which they take of it, it may still appear to be fundamental, as involving the very groundwork of their own private belief. And this is a good reason why they should cling firmly to that which is the main stay of all their religious convictions. But it is not a reason why they should attempt to force others to rest their belief on the same ground, still less why they should charge those who take a different view of the subject with unbelief or unsoundness in the faith. One who has been used to regard the authorized translation of the Bible as of equal authority with the original text, will

naturally shrink from a proposal to make any change in the sacred words with which his deepest feelings of veneration are inseparably associated by life-long habit. And he would certainly have a right to complain, if any one compelled him to use a new or altered version. But the right would not be on his side, if, not content with opposing those who wish to bring the translation into closer correspondence with the original, he should accuse them of irreverence, or of a design to corrupt and mutilate the Scriptures. Yet I believe this would be neither a purely imaginary, nor an extreme case. An eminent person, whose opinion carries much weight with it in some religious circles, is reported to have expressed himself publicly to the effect, "that it would be far better to plunge at once into infidelity or atheism, than to stand in the position of one who denies the plenary inspiration of Scripture; because this cuts from under us the very ground on which we stand^s." As a description of personal experience, such language may not be extravagant; and the state of mind which it indicates, so long as it is kept within its proper bounds, is entitled to the utmost tenderness and sympathy. But when this individual consciousness is set up as the common measure of truth, to which all are required to conform under penalty of exclusion from Christian fellowship, it becomes an instrument

^s See "The Bible and Lord Shaftesbury," by the Rev. Henry Burgess, p. 29.

of aggression on the rights of conscience, and usurpation of authority which belongs only to the Church.

If we refer, as we are bound to do, to the Church's standards of doctrine, we find that she has pronounced no decision, has laid down no definition on this subject. It was indeed hardly possible that she should have done so. For the whole question as to the nature and extent of the inspiration of Scripture, is one of modern, and among ourselves of very recent, origin. And there was nothing in any of the controversies in which she was engaged, to call for or suggest a formal exposition of her views on these points. It was only in her dispute with the Church of Rome that she had occasion to assert the sufficiency of Holy Scripture, as containing all things necessary to salvation, and so to reject the claim of equal dignity which had been advanced in behalf of an unscriptural tradition, and of the decrees, whether of pope or council, as living oracles of Divine truth. In this sense she requires her ministers to acknowledge the supremacy of Scripture. And though she does not expressly speak either of its supremacy or its infallibility, yet that acknowledgment clearly implies a confession of infallibility to the same extent. For it would be mere trifling to assert the sufficiency of Scripture, as containing all things necessary to salvation, unless there was an equally sure warrant for their truth as for their necessity. And in the Second Part of the Exhortation to the Reading of Holy Scripture, we are exhorted to "stay, quiet, and certify our

consciences with the most infallible certainty, truth, and perpetual assurance” of “these holy rules, injunctions, and statutes of our Christian religion.” But as the Article confines itself to things necessary to salvation, so the Homily grounds its exhortation entirely on such uses of Scripture as are subservient to the same end. But with regard to things which lie outside of this circle, and have no special connexion either with faith or practice,—as in another Homily it is remarked, that “the rehearsal of the genealogies and pedigrees of the fathers is not to much edification of the plain ignorant people,”—the Church has not delivered any dogmatical determination as to the infallibility of Scripture, or the mode by which it was divinely secured. She could have had no inducement to frame an Article for avoiding diversities of opinions on these subjects, unless she had been enabled to foresee the speculations and controversies which were to spring up in later times with respect to them. Some may wish that she had been endued with such prescience; others may think that it was wisely and graciously withheld. But the fact remains, that she has not bound her ministers by any authoritative statement on these questions, but has left them at liberty to inquire for themselves, and to arrive at such conclusions as best satisfy their own judgments. It would therefore be a waste of time to consider what her decision would probably have been if an occasion had arisen to call for one. To my own mind indeed, independently of historical facts, the

whole tenor of the language in which she expresses her profound veneration for Holy Scripture, seems to leave little room for doubt as to which side she would have taken in any controversy which appeared to affect its dignity and authority. But this, however certain it may appear, though it may raise a presumption in favour of that view which she would have preferred, and though it ought especially to protect those who adhere to that view from hard or contemptuous language on the part of their opponents, still cannot be allowed to abridge the right of free investigation which has actually been left to the ministers of the Church in this department of theology. Nor ought it to be lightly assumed, that those who, in the exercise of that right, have been led to a different conclusion, one perhaps less in accordance with the mind of the Church at an earlier period, do not fully share that veneration for Holy Scripture which breathes through all her formularies. This freedom has been used by men of whom it is impossible to doubt, that they heartily accepted and revered the Scriptures as the Divine Rule of Faith and Practice, and yet conceived their infallibility to be not absolute, but relative. And when the principle is conceded, its application must be left to the discretion of each individual, which cannot be rightfully limited by any authority lower than that of the Church. Those only who are not conversant with the subject, can fail to be aware that it is beset with conflicting difficulties, between which a choice has to be made; and it is an

inevitable incident of our nature that these difficulties should be variously estimated by different minds, so that what to one appears the greater, should to another appear the less. And there can hardly be a case in which that intolerant spirit, to which I have so frequently alluded in this address, shows itself in a more unamiable light, or with more pernicious effects, than when it confounds the advocates with the assailants of Christianity, and not only rejects their services in behalf of the common cause, but charges them with treachery and apostasy, because they would wage the contest on a different ground from that on which it has itself been used to take its stand.

But these general remarks might be in danger of being misapplied, unless I added a few of a more special nature. The author, whose orthodoxy had been impugned on account of his volume of Sermons, resorted in self-defence to a course of proceeding which, as far as regards its avowed object, must be admitted to be fair, manly, and every way worthy of his character and station. "As the most inoffensive mode of correcting some mis-statements about his book, for which," as he says, "he is far from claiming infallibility, but which he wishes to see represented fairly, and discussed calmly," he published his own explanation of its "true meaning" in a series of Propositions. And he has since re-published this statement with some slight alterations, and with the addition of a fresh series of propositions, extracted, either verbally or in substance, from his Sermons, and running

parallel to a series of counter-propositions which he conceives must, by logical necessity, be adopted by all who reject his⁹. If this was a case for judgment in a Court of Heresy, perhaps the author might be considered as no longer responsible for any statement in his book which is not repeated in this explanation of its true meaning. But if we are not confined to the strictly legal or technical point of view, but are still at liberty—as the author would undoubtedly admit—to examine the whole work with the aid of those propositions, and are not bound to treat them as a complete substitute for it, then it seems very doubtful whether much has been gained by that explanation, and whether it is well adapted to either of the ends which the author appears to have had in view; that is, “fair representation,” and “calm discussion.” I am constrained to say that he must have been labouring under a very strange and unhappy delusion, when he imagined that calmness of discussion could be promoted either by the terms which he applies to his opponents, or by the antithesis in which he exhibits their supposed opinions—being the inferences which he draws from their objections to his doctrine—in contrast to his own. I know not how far this asperity may have been provoked by the language of his assailants, but I am sure that it could not tend to allay the heat of controversy, and that it was not better

⁹ “Lampeter Theology Exemplified in Extracts from the Vice-Principal’s Lectures, Letters, and Sermons.”

sued to further the interests of truth than those of charity; and I lament that, if he felt himself aggrieved by the manner in which his writings were attacked, he did not rather endeavour to shame his adversaries by the contrast of a milder and more dignified tone.

But the graver question is, how far these propositions are an adequate representation of the statements which have given most offence in his work, considered as a whole. And I must own that I doubt whether, if they had appeared first, they would have prepared any one for all that was to be found on the same head in the Sermons. I am inclined to think that, if they would then have seemed strange or startling to an intelligent reader, it would have been not so much on account of any thing which they distinctly state, as of the difficulty of perceiving their exact drift and their collective import, and because such a reader might conceive a suspicion of something behind them all, which they were meant to suggest, but not to express. It is, as I have observed, characteristic of the author's style, that it is generally apt to make such an impression. But here the effect is produced not merely by the form or wording, but by the substance and nature of the propositions themselves. They look like fragmentary outlines of a system which cannot be fully appreciated, until the parts are put together and viewed as a connected whole. And when such a suspicion is once roused, it will be strengthened by things that would otherwise have served to divert

it. The vagueness, the simplicity, the undeniable truth of some of these propositions, will make them appear, not pointless or commonplace, but the more significant and emphatic. And when it is remembered that they were framed, not as a simple enunciation of doctrine, but for an apologetic controversial purpose, it will be the more difficult to believe that, where their obvious sense is most harmless and self-evident, it does not cover a depth of questionable meaning.

Thus the first proposition consists of three parts. It begins with a definition of Revelation, stating what it is, generally and "especially." "Revelation is an unveiling of the true God, especially as Love and as a Spirit, to the eyes of the mind." When we recollect that the true God is a Spirit, it may seem a little strange to find one of his attributes thus coupled with his essential nature. It will however not be denied that both will be included in every complete, or not materially imperfect revelation of the Godhead. And the definition has the advantage of the greatest possible comprehensiveness in other respects; for it embraces every conceivable process by which our knowledge of the true God, in His nature, His attributes, His works, and His will, may be acquired or enlarged. But this advantage is attended with the inconvenience, that the definition is utterly useless for the purpose for which it might have been supposed to have been designed, that of throwing light on the Author's views of Revelation; for it leaves us wholly unin-

formed, whether he admits any distinction among those various processes, by virtue of which the name of Revelation would be more properly applied to one than to another. The proposition proceeds to state wherein "much of the evidence of Revelation consists," namely, "in its conformity to whatever is best in the moral nature given, and kept alive in us by our Maker." But here it seems evident, that the author has confounded the object or matter of Revelation with the process, which was the proper subject of the definition; for that conformity to our moral nature must lie in the things revealed, not in the revealing. So that as to the evidence of this, as distinct from the things themselves, the proposition is still altogether silent. It concludes with the inference, that "to vilify mankind overmuch, is not honouring Almighty God so much as degenerating his handiwork, and is injurious to religion;" a sentiment which will probably command very general assent, but which may also give occasion for surprise, that so large a basis should have been laid for so slight a superstructure.

The absence of any definite statement on the subject of Revelation, in a proposition which professedly treats of it, is the more remarkable, because in the next there is apparently a plain intimation, that in some sense or other Revelation is common to Jews and Gentiles. For "God," it is said, "left Himself no where without witness, but fashioned the hearts of the heathen, and put a Scripture in their conscience."

It would therefore have been more satisfactory, if the author had explained, in what respect, according to his view, the Revelation made to the Jews differed from that made to the Gentiles.

On the kindred subject of Inspiration, the propositions are much more explicit. Many of them are expressly devoted to it, and others bear more or less upon it. In these the author dwells on the distinction between "things of heaven" and "things of earth," facts which could only have been learnt supernaturally, and facts of daily life and experience, as marking a limit which, however difficult it may be to trace, he believes to exist in Scripture, between "the truth of God" and "the thoughts of fallible men." He insists on the presence of a human element in the sacred writings, as constituting a main condition of their power and efficacy, as an instrument for reaching the heart and stirring the affections of men, but at the same time as implying some imperfection of knowledge, and some liability to error, which however in his judgment cannot properly affect the value of Scripture as a book of religion and devotion. And he thinks it necessary to deny that "the Books of the New Testament were *dictated* in words audible from the clouds of heaven," and that "Inspiration, even in its proper sphere"—that is, as concerning things of heaven—"implies omniscience."

So far, however open to controversy these statements may be, there is nothing new or peculiar to the writer in the general principle which they involve.

But when he proceeds to explain his own view of the nature of Inspiration, he diverges much further from the ideas commonly associated with the term. For he seems to confine the agency of the Holy Spirit as its author, to his sanctifying influence, and to deny that it ever implies any illumination of the mind, which is not the result of that influence on the heart. Undoubtedly the positive side of this proposition cannot be too strongly affirmed: but it ought not to be confounded with the negative side, as it is by the author, when, having most truly observed that "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, and a good heart will clear the intellect," he proceeds to say: "Thus, the more spiritual any man's life, the more inspired his writings; and the Apostles who had most of the temper and mind of Christ, were the most eminently inspired." This, if it only means that those of them were the holiest who had most of the temper and mind of Christ, is a truism: but if it is meant to deny that they were inspired in any other sense, it comes nearer to a paradox, and is at all events an assertion which remains to be proved. The author indeed believes that he has here the authority of the Church expressly on his side, because "in her Collects she teaches all Christians to pray for the Holy Spirit, in terms fully as emphatical as those in which inspiration is ascribed to the sacred writers in the *Greek* of the New Testament:" from which he infers, that "the Church seems to hold that inspiration was not confined to the Apostles." And no

doubt, in his sense of the word, the Church does most firmly hold this: but how it follows that, because she teaches her children throughout all ages to pray for the gifts of the Holy Spirit, she must hold that the sacred writers were not the subjects of inspiration in any other sense, and received no more direct illumination than every Christian at this day may reasonably expect in answer to his prayers, is more than I am able to understand. The Church, as I have observed, be it unhappily or happily, has not dogmatized on this point: she has not cast her view of the inspiration of Scripture in any stereotyped formula: but if we wish to gather it by inference from her words, we must at least reason from those in which she is speaking of the peculiar functions of the sacred writers, and not from those which refer to the ordinary experience of Christian men.

But it would only lead me away from the main point, if I were to proceed farther in the examination of these Propositions. For on the whole it appears to me that they throw very little light on the Sermons, but stand in great need of illustration from them: and that, if it is possible to arrive at a clear insight into the author's system, it will be by the study, not of the propositions, but of the book. It is by means of that alone that any thing like a complete estimate can be formed of his teaching, with regard to Revelation and Inspiration, to the relation between Scripture and the Church, and between the Old Dispensation and that of the New Testament. I shall make a few

remarks on these points: and it will be convenient first to consider the place which he assigns to Scripture in its relation to the Church: especially as this appears to be one, and perhaps the chief, ground of the complaint, that the statements of the book seriously affect the supremacy of Holy Scripture. Several of these statements very emphatically describe the relation of Scripture to the Church, as one of subsequence, of dependence, and therefore, as it may seem, of inferiority. The "volume of Holy Scripture," it is said in one passage, "embodies the experience of the Church of old; the record of her Revelations, and the tradition of her spiritual life; the transfusion, as it were, of her spirit into writing¹." In another it is granted—as an admission which may safely be made to the Romanist as well as to many Anglicans—that "the Church was before the Bible, as a speaker is before his voice; and that Holy Scripture is not the foundation of the Christian faith so much as its creature, its expression, and its embodiment." It seems to have been thought that this language is at variance with the Divine origin of Scripture, and traces it to a human source². But this

¹ Sermon XIX. "Servants of God speaking as moved by the Holy Ghost." I shall not think it necessary to give the page of each quotation.

² See "Rational Godliness by Rowland Williams, B.D. An Examination into the Author's Views on Holy Scripture, Sermon XIX. being specially considered. By the Rev. J. Powell Jones, B.D., Rector of Loughor."

appears to me a misapprehension. There is certainly no contradiction between the statement that Scripture records the revelations of the Church, and the admission that those revelations proceeded from God. It is quite consistent to say that the Church was before the Bible, and that Revelation was before the Church: to say that Holy Scripture is not the foundation so much as the creature of the Christian faith, and yet that Revelation is not the creature so much as the foundation of that faith. One who asserts that the sacred writers only "expressed thoughts that were stirring in the breast of the Church," need not be supposed to deny that what they made known was "the mind of the Lord." No question is raised by such statements as to the origin of the Revelation, but only as to the mode of its transmission. The truth that the Church was before the Bible, is not the less certain because it has been abused by the Romanist: and it is confirmed by the testimony of the Bible itself. And then it follows that there must be a sense in which it is allowable and necessary to affirm, that Scripture embodies the experience, expresses the thoughts, makes known that which was the mind of the Church, no less than of the Lord. For otherwise it would have revealed a new faith, which had not been delivered to the Church by the teaching of Christ and his Apostles. Even with regard to St. Paul, it must be admitted that his doctrine had been that of the Church which he persecuted. Else he would have been the founder of a

new religion. But his case shows that the conformity of the apostolical writings to the faith of the Church, proves nothing as to their immediate origin. As to those who had been deeply imbued with that faith, there might be room for doubt, whether any special, direct, heavenly communication was required, to enable them to expound it accurately. But of St. Paul we know, that he “neither received his gospel of man, neither was taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.” So that if his Epistles are said to be “utterances of the Church,” it can only be in a sense widely different from that which the phrase naturally suggests, and which the whole context indicates to have been the author’s true meaning.

But there is another point of view in which the supremacy of Scripture may appear to be more seriously endangered by some of his statements. The grounds on which he rests its claims to our reverence, do not seem to be of the highest order. He thinks it “reasonable to say” that “to ourselves as members of the Church of England, it must be the great standard of theological doctrine:” and he holds that “we justly regard it with veneration,” and “exhorts every one to value it highly.” But he appears to intimate that it is entitled to such veneration and esteem, rather as a monument of primitive antiquity, and as a record of the personal experience, thoughts, and feelings of holy men, especially “of those who walked with Christ, and heard the gracious words which He spake,” than on account of its intrinsic

value, or its peculiar and paramount authority, even as the perpetual rule of faith and practice. For he would have it acknowledged, "that this Holy Scripture has also something behind it deeper and far holier still:" and he proceeds to observe that "if that Spirit by which holy men spake of old, is for ever a living and a present power, its later lessons may well transcend its earlier, and there may reside in the Church a power of bringing out of her treasury things new as well as things old," where it is not obscurely implied, that the new things may well be the better.

I should be sorry to put an invidious construction on this language. Though it may lend itself on the one hand to a Romish theory of development, on the other to the fancies of individual enthusiasts, I am persuaded that the author's meaning is equally remote from both. And I would not deny that there is a sense in which the statement may be accepted, and in which it will be found not only not to depreciate but to enhance the value and dignity of Holy Scripture. For the fulness of the stream is the glory of the fountain: and it is because the Ganges is not lost among its native hills, but deepens and widens until it reaches the ocean, that so many pilgrimages are made to its springs. And to the end of time there can be no assignable limit to the true development, and above all to the practical application of the truths contained in Holy Scripture: and so the later stages of this development may well "transcend the earlier, the new things be better than the old."

But yet the very test by which the true development is distinguished from the false, the right application from the wrong, and by which it is discerned that the process is carried on under the guidance of the Spirit of truth, will be its constant subordination to the authority of the original rule, and that, not as a mere conventional standard, but as one superior to every other, in kind as well as in degree. I only lament that here, as in many other parts of his writings, the author's peculiar style or manner has obscured his meaning, so as to leave it doubtful whether he intended or would be willing to adopt such a qualification as I have pointed out.

But much more serious and perplexing doubts are suggested by his view of the Old Testament, and of the relation between Judaism and Christianity, which is unfolded in a sermon to which he himself refers as one "than which there is none in the volume which better expresses what may seem the peculiarities of his theology, or which he would sooner indicate as a key to the rest³." The simple but grave question which is raised by this view is: whether there is place or room in his system, for any supernatural communication from God to man, before the coming of Christ. If there be, it is at least not clearly marked. All that others have referred to such a communication, seems there to resolve itself into a phenomenon, either of a law of nature or of God's providential government. There

³ Sermon XIV. "The Kingdom of God a Kingdom of the Mind."

was indeed, according to this theory, a kind of real correspondence or analogy between the prophecies of the Old Dispensation, and the events of the New. But that correspondence was hidden in the depths of the Divine counsels, and never revealed to man, until Christ came to set up that "kingdom of the mind," in which it was to be made manifest to those who were enlightened to perceive it. "Thus in fact," we are told, "the great and emphatically true prophet was Almighty God." And all that is said of the human prophets points to the conclusion, that they only gave utterance to the religious instincts and aspirations of the Hebrew mind, in which, by the original constitution of its character, and its providential development, there was laid "a train of glowing hopes and vague anticipations," which were destined to be realized only in a sense wholly foreign to their nature and object, as prayer may be said to be answered, when the Divine wisdom, in its mercy and goodness, withholds that which is asked, and gives some totally different, but far better thing in its stead. Those hopes and anticipations were purely natural: for they not only fell far short of the spiritual reality, but were permitted to take a wrong direction, in which they were on the whole utterly disappointed, and the prophecies which expressed them remained unfulfilled.

It may indeed seem as if a supernatural communication was sufficiently implied in the presence of the Holy Spirit, which is represented as filling

an important part under the Old, as well as under the New Dispensation⁴. But when we look a little closer at the description given of the operations of this heavenly Agent, it rather suggests the notion of a regular perpetual universal indwelling, which belongs to the permanent order of Providence in the government of the world, and is no otherwise supernatural than as it is Divine. But so, we are reminded, "every gracious quality, every keen perception even of great moral truths, is more or less from God:" and in another remarkable passage it is suggested as consistent with the more reasonable view of Providence, that "the Lord may write the Bible, on the same principle as the Lord builds the city⁵:" "for every part played by man comes from the Divine Disposer of the scene." The author sometimes limits the province of the Holy Spirit to the sphere of the affections and the conscience⁶; at other times he describes the range of its operations as comprehending every function of man's intellectual nature⁷: but in every point of view he appears to extend it to all the families of the human race. The "Divine Teacher of mankind" "educates nations and churches," which "represent, throughout fleeting generations, the everlasting Providence and Spirit of God." Also, "by the Spirit of God the ancient heroes founded kingdoms, and legislators devised

⁴ Sermon XV. "The Spirit's Operations.

⁵ Sermon XIX., p. 292.

⁶ P. 294.

⁷ Sermon XV.

laws, and the fair fabric of every science was reared," "the greatest triumphs achieved by the human mind, in undertakings which required a complete balance of all its powers, are due in some measure to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit." And once more: "if this has been the case with the giants, why not also with the masses?" why be "afraid of recognizing in the linked march of the nations, a career not unguided of God's good Spirit?"

I refer to these passages, not as meaning to deny that there may be a sense in which all this may be very truly said, but only to show that there is nothing in this manifold agency of the Holy Spirit that implies any thing that can be properly called a supernatural communication of Divine truth. And then it would seem to follow, that in the author's scheme the first, and hitherto the last, communication of that kind in the history of the world is that which was made by what he calls "the positive Incarnation of the Son." This complete insulation may indeed appear to exalt the magnitude and importance of that event: but with reference to other parts of the author's theory, it rather suggests some perplexing doubts. For the main object of our Lord's coming in the flesh is represented to have been, to "produce a change in men's conceptions" of the Divine nature and dealings. And the revelation by which this change was produced, is described as "an expansion of the conscience," and especially as the "putting aside of much natural prejudice with all such local and

personal predilections as acted upon the mind *like a veil* between its gaze and the true likeness of God." But it is not clear that there was any thing, either in the object or in the process, to require such a stupendous intervention of Divine power. For that "change in man's conceptions"—which are said to have been those of "runder ages"—was apparently not radical and total, but rather a correction and enlargement, than the substitution of any thing absolutely new. And that revelation does not seem essentially to differ from the ordinary work attributed to the Holy Spirit in the education of mankind. And so, "if," as the author believes, "the destined course of the world be really one of providential progress," it may appear as if the whole of our Lord's prophetic office might very well have entered into it without any break in the natural sequence of events. It is true that the more mysterious sides of his character are more or less fully recognized: but it is not quite evident that they properly belong to the author's system, and have not rather been transferred to it from others in which they have a more natural and fitting place.

I cannot therefore be surprised, that the work should in some minds have left the painful impression, that its ultimate tendency is to efface the distinction between natural and revealed religion. But I gladly declare my conviction, that if there be such a tendency in it, it is only in the letter of the book, and not in the consciousness of the author. And I can

readily believe, that in this case, as in so many others, the man is better than his work; and that whatever he has said in depreciation of the letter as compared with the spirit, will be found applicable to himself: that the later lessons will transcend the earlier, and the new things prove better than the old. And especially I both hope and trust that his oral teaching is and will be more judiciously measured, more cautiously guarded, more exactly balanced, and in all respects less open to misconstruction than many parts of his writings. And I will add that I feel such confidence in his personal character, as assures me that the liberty he enjoys will be to him the most effectual of all restraints; and therefore I cannot even wish that it had been less. Where the constitution of a college invests the governing body with despotic authority, even the publication of a metaphysical paradox may be thought to justify the removal of a teacher, however conspicuous for a rare combination of the noblest qualities of mind and heart; for genius and eloquence, for piety and virtue, for energy and devotedness to the service of God and man. But I am not sure that the interests of such an institution are promoted by either the exercise or the possession of such a power. That which is actually lodged in the Visitor of St. David's College, only enables him to deprive any of its officers for misconduct or incapacity. And thus they obtain a degree of independence in the performance of their duties, which is no doubt liable to abuse, and which renders it the

more important to exert the utmost vigilance in the selection of those who are entrusted with it. But on the whole I regard it as an advantage, which I should be very loath to exchange for any additional security.

I now turn to a few other topics, on which I shall not need to occupy much more of your time.

I am happy to be able to speak thankfully and hopefully of the progress which has been made since we last met, in supplying the wants of the Diocese, both as to churches and schools. The number of new or restored churches which have been completed in the course of the present year, denotes an increasing ratio; and the style of them all presents a cheering contrast to the slight, paltry, unsightly edifices which were the result of almost every attempt at church-building among us in the last generation, under the combined influence of bad taste and a false economy, which happily did not aim at providing for a very remote posterity. On the other hand, I have still to lament the difficulty which in small rural parishes continues to impede the execution of the most urgently needed repairs; sometimes from the poverty of the parishioners, sometimes from the inertness or positive resistance of lay impropiators, who, though bound by the most sacred obligations of law, justice, honour, and religion, to keep chancels in repair, neglect and elude the performance of that duty. In other cases again, where a church-rate has been duly made, its collection is prevented by an organized system of chicanery, set in motion, as I have

reason to believe, by an association instituted for that purpose. The partial success of such attempts must increase our anxiety for an equitable settlement of the whole question. But the spirit which they indicate is, I fear, rather gaining than losing strength in the quarter to which we have to look for such a settlement.

The work of elementary education is likewise unhappily retarded by causes over which its friends have no control. The general poverty of some extensive districts opposes an obstacle to the establishment and maintenance of schools, which can only be surmounted by aid from without. And such aid could not at present be extended to them by the State, without some relaxation of the rules which govern the dispensation of the public funds allotted to this object. In the early part of the year I for a time entertained a rather sanguine hope, that the peculiar circumstances of the Diocese, and particularly of the part of Radnorshire included in it, might have been considered as a sufficient ground for such an exceptional relaxation; but there were reasons which were thought to show that it would be an unseasonable and dangerous departure from the principle on which the Parliamentary Education Grant has hitherto been administered. While I can only lament, without presuming to complain of this determination, I may at least hope that the Committee of Council will maintain that impartiality toward the various religious bodies which claim a share of its

funds for their schools, by which its proceedings have hitherto been marked, and that it will not listen to the recommendation which it has received from one of its inspectors, who has thought proper to advise that it should modify its present system for the express purpose of favouring the schools of the British and Foreign School Society, at the expense of those which are connected with our Church throughout the Principality. This proposal is, I am afraid, a sample of the measure of justice which the Church has to expect from her adversaries, whenever they gain an ascendancy in the State; but at present it is, I trust, premature. And I venture to hope that the time is yet distant, when the efforts of the Church to promote the religious education of her children, will be directly and avowedly discouraged by any Government in this country.

The peculiar difficulties in the way of the progress and extension of such education among us, presented by the prevalence of dissent, and the large number of children who are not members of the Established Church, are noticed for a very different purpose in the excellent Report of the Welsh Education Committee, published this year, not as reasons for abandoning the object, but as requiring that "the management of Church schools be adapted to the actual position of the country in a spirit of forbearance and Christian tenderness." The maxim on which the Report grounds its recommendations on this head, is one of very extensive application, one which might have been

thought an axiom of common sense, if it had not been so often practically contradicted: it is, that we should do as much good as we can, and should not refuse to do a little because we cannot do more, or as much as we would. But no doubt even when this principle is admitted to regulate the religious teaching in Church schools under such circumstances, the application of the principle to practice may often be very difficult, and may call for a degree of judgment and tact which is by no means common. It is with reference to the same subject that a startling announcement was made by the Rev. H. L. Jones, Her Majesty's Inspector of Schools, in his General Report, for the year 1855, on the Church of England Schools inspected in Wales. He there expressed his deliberate conviction, that "unless religion in the parochial system of Welsh education is to fall away instead of advancing, the immediate and united action of the four Bishops is imperatively necessary." And the specific evils which call for such action are stated to be those which arise from "anarchy, neglect, and incapacity." "These three sources of evil," it is observed, "are of more frequent occurrence than they should be; and some means of obviating them must be found, or religious instruction will suffer greatly from the result." Here, with regard to neglect and incapacity, the only thing that seemed difficult to understand was how, if the remedy of the evil lay within the power of the Bishops, it could be more effectually applied by their united action than by that of each in his own Diocese. But

the allusion to *anarchy*, without some farther explanation, was quite unintelligible. The Rev. Inspector afterwards explained his meaning in two letters, both of which have been published⁸. And it now appears that the "anarchy" which he had in view, consists in the absence of a uniform system imposed by the authority of the Bishops on the Clergy and managers of schools, both as to the amount and the special character of the religious instruction given in Church schools. That in both these respects a great diversity should be found, was to be expected every where, but above all under the circumstances of the Principality. And it cannot be denied, that such diversity is at the best a necessary evil. But how little desirable it would be, even if possible, to obviate it by a uniformity of system, which should compel the Clergy and school-managers to observe the same rule as to the amount of religious instruction, may be gathered—if it is not self-evident—from the observations to which I have already referred in the Report of the Welsh Education Committee. The other point raises a still greater difficulty. The Rev. Inspector "perceives the existence of anarchy still more," when he "finds in neighbouring schools the opposite extremes of the religious opinions which are allowed to divide the Church into two totally distinct sects, strictly maintained in

⁸ See "A Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of Llandaff, in reference to the Report of Her Majesty's Inspector of Schools," by the Bishop of the Diocese; and "A Letter to the Lord Bishop of Llandaff in Reply," by the Inspector of the District.

the religious instruction given to the children⁹." But if this kind of anarchy is to be reduced to order by the united action of the ecclesiastical authorities, it seems clear that their own unanimity on the subject must be an indispensable condition of their mutual co-operation. It must be a pleasure to believe that such unanimity actually exists, without the slightest variance, among the present occupiers of the four Welsh Sees; though it would be hardly safe to assume, as the writer appears to do, that it necessarily pervades the whole episcopal body. But even if this were the case, it would not be obvious that the Bishops—still less that any four of them—possess the means either of reconciling the conflicting opinions which are "allowed to divide the Church," or to terminate the dispute by a decision in favour of either party. And until this is done, it would seem that the difference must continue to affect the character of the religious teaching in the school as well as in the Church.

But though the remedy which has been proposed may be inappropriate and inapplicable, it will not follow either that the evil does not exist, or that we ought to resign ourselves to it, as one which we can neither remove nor mitigate. As to the alleged anarchy indeed, I have heard nothing from any other quarter. But the results of the inquiry instituted in the course of this year by the National Society, through some of the Clergy of the Diocese who kindly

⁹ P. 8.

undertook the task, disclose a lamentable deficiency in the number of schools : and the Reports which I have received from Mr. Stammers of the observations which he has made in the course of his successive circuits in the Diocese, as organizing master, show that the quality of the instruction, both secular and religious, is in many schools very unsatisfactory. It would no doubt be a mistake to refer either of these defects to any single cause ; but I think there is reason to believe that to some extent they might both be corrected by the use of the same means. The Report of Her Majesty's Inspector, on which I have already commented, insists strongly on the need of some modification of the existing Minutes of the Committee of Council, to meet the peculiar exigencies of the Principality. This is a kind of assistance for which we must depend on the will of others, and for which we may yet have long to wait. But it is so much the more important to consider, whether the resources of the Diocese itself have been drawn forth as far as is immediately practicable, and whether all which are actually available are dispensed to the greatest possible advantage. As to this last point, I find but one opinion expressed by those who have had the best opportunities of information, with regard to the general inefficiency of the temporary schools supported by the Bevan Charity ; and it seems clear that, while the instruction which they diffuse is of the lowest order, the system under which the Charity is at present administered, rather obstructs than pro-

notes the progress of sound elementary education. "The effect of its present operations," it is observed in one of the Reports which I have received, "is to diminish individual exertion." If the benefits which it yields were far greater than they appear to be, they could never compensate the injury indicated by this simple remark. I am convinced that, under a different system, the funds of the Charity might be made to contribute at once to the multiplication of permanent schools, and to the improvement of those which now exist. This must always depend in a great measure on the amount of remuneration which can be offered to the teacher; not of course as an operative cause, but as a necessary condition. And certainly it cannot be said, that the means to be found within the Diocese, of raising the ordinary standard of that remuneration to a height at which it would command the services of trained teachers, have yet been exhausted.

I have on previous occasions gratefully acknowledged the exertions which have been made in many parts of the Diocese for the establishment of schools. But its collective efforts for the like purpose are measured by the amount of the yearly subscriptions received by the Church Union Society. And though that amount has of late years been somewhat increased by collections made in churches, it still falls far short of what might be reasonably expected, and, in fact, with the exception of those collections, represents little more than the contributions of the Clergy. I am persuaded that

it would be unjust to the lay-members of the Church, to attribute this fact to a general indifference on their part, and not to the absence of sufficient information, or the extensive prevalence of misconception with regard to the object to which this branch of the Society's operations are and have been exclusively directed. With the view of guarding against the mistake which is so naturally suggested by the name of the Society, that of supposing this object to be one in which the Clergy have some peculiar professional interest, it has been resolved that what has hitherto been known as the Committee of the Society, shall in future bear the title of the Education Board of the Diocese; and it is designed to subdivide it, so that there shall be one in each archdeaconry, which shall collect and administer its own funds. And it is hoped that this new organization may attract not only the pecuniary aid, but the personal co-operation, of the laity.

Yet I must remind my reverend brethren, that whatever may be the success of this or of any other attempt to augment the funds destined to educational purposes, the real ultimate benefit to the Church will depend mainly on themselves. Praiseworthy as are the exertions and sacrifices which many of them have made in order to provide schools for their respective parishes, it must be remembered that these are only to be regarded in the light of means to an end; and that, if after this has been done, they should withhold their personal attention and superintendence from the work, there will be a certainty that the end will be

but very imperfectly attained, and great danger that the cost and labour may have been almost utterly wasted.

There is yet another subject on which I feel myself obliged to say a few words. Manifold and urgent as are the wants of this Diocese, they have never prevented us—and I trust never will prevent us—from contributing in our measure to the support of the various Societies, through which the Church of England strives to fulfil certain parts of her duty, for which no provision has been made in her ancient endowment, such as the extension of facilities for public worship and of pastoral superintendence, the education of her poor children, the preservation of the Gospel among our countrymen settled in our colonies, and the propagation of it in all parts of the world. From some of these Societies indeed we have received so much benefit, that whatever we contribute to their funds, ought to be considered not merely as a free-will offering, but as the payment of a debt. This remark applies especially to the Church Building Society and the National Society. But with regard to those which have no such special claim upon us, particularly the Societies through which the Church carries on her missionary work, our co-operation is at once a duty and a privilege; and we could not, without loss and hurt to ourselves, renounce our share in this labour of Christian love. The withdrawal of the Royal sanction which used to be given to periodical collections in behalf of three of those Societies, has in its

immediate effect operated to their disadvantage. But as it cannot affect the ground on which their claims are based, it is to be hoped that it will not permanently contract their means of usefulness. And it is at least satisfactory to know, that it need not be considered as an indication even of indifference, much less of hostility, to the objects which they seek to promote, on the part of those who are immediately responsible for it. The real origin of the proceeding, which certainly at first wore that appearance, has since been cleared up by a document which I received last year, and which is styled "A Declaration respecting the use of 'Episcopal' in lieu of 'Queen's' Letters." It is now evident that the whole transaction has been a manœuvre, prompted by a feeling of emulation, which, if it had been kept within its proper limits, would have been highly praiseworthy, but which, on this occasion, seems to have degenerated into a very mean and unholy jealousy. Some Societies—or rather most probably the agents of some Societies—which had not shared in that mark of Royal approbation which has been recently withheld, appear to have conceived that whatever advantage was withdrawn from those whom they looked upon as their rivals, would be so much gained for themselves. I am afraid it will turn out that they have only succeeded in one half of their object, and have inflicted an injury from which none will derive the smallest benefit. It was however quite natural that, having effected the discontinuance of the Queen's Letters, they should

wish to suppress all similar manifestations of sentiment on the part of the Bishops; though it was less to have been expected that they should have attempted to do so under colour of respect for episcopal authority, which is put forward in the Declaration as one of the principal motives which animated those who affixed their signature to it. And the noble person who, as I learn from a letter which accompanied the copy forwarded to me, has taken the lead in this movement, and to whose influence, as there is good reason to believe, its success, such as it is, has been principally owing, had not previously been so distinguished by his peculiar sensitiveness as to the respect due to episcopal authority, or by his intense solicitude for the maintenance of ecclesiastical discipline, as to warrant a surmise that this was the weak side by which he had been won to lend himself as an instrument for carrying out such a design.

I therefore rejoice that the number of the Clergy of my Diocese who have suffered their names to be appended to this Declaration, is exceedingly small—very little over a dozen; and I feel sure that if they had more maturely considered its contents, they could not have failed to perceive the hollowness and absurdity of the pretexts which it alleges to cover its real object. As to the Bishops, it proceeds on one of two suppositions. It implies either that in their exhortations to their Clergy, with which they accompanied the Royal Letters, they acted in a purely mechanical subservience to the civil authority, and used language which did

not really express any judgment or feeling of their own; or else that, having been in earnest, and having meant what they said, they were bound either to retract or to conceal their opinion as soon as it ceased to be endorsed with the Royal sanction, or, more properly, with that of the first Minister of the Crown. This is the substance of that which the framers of this document, and the noble Earl who is chiefly responsible for it, would fain have to be regarded as a delicate mark of respect for episcopal authority. As to the Clergy, the danger which these persons profess to apprehend from the issuing of the Episcopal Letters is, lest "it may oblige the Clergy either to disregard the injunction of their Bishop, or, out of deference to his office, to advocate a cause they do not cordially approve." But this is simply a palpable mistake as to a matter of fact. No doubt those letters always assume that the cause which they recommend is one with which both the Clergy and the faithful Laity feel some degree of sympathy; as indeed it would be no less hard than painful to believe, that there is any Churchman who deliberately and conscientiously disapproves of the objects for which the Societies in question were instituted. But if such a case should unhappily occur, the Letters could not be intended to oblige the Clergy to advocate a cause they do not approve; nor do I believe that any clergyman ever felt himself placed by such Letters in the embarrassing position which the Declaration describes. None could doubt that, under the circumstances supposed, he

would be doing all that was required of him, if he read the statement and letter transmitted to him, and so left the whole matter in the hands of his congregation. This danger therefore is purely imaginary and fictitious. But the supposition involved in the suggestion of it is injurious and insulting alike to the Bishops and to the Clergy.

But the Declaration points out another like danger which threatens the Laity from the same cause: "It may oblige the Laity either to neglect the appeal of their pastor, or to support, by their offerings, a Society which has not their sympathy." On this it may suffice to remark, that no clergyman who has signed this Paper can ever again consistently preach a sermon in behalf of any religious Society. For he can never have a right to presume that there exists in his congregation a perfect unanimity on a subject as to which he himself may happen to differ from his Diocesan: and unless such unanimity prevails among them, some of them "must either neglect his appeal, or support by their offerings a Society which has not their sympathy." And thus he usurps that very authority over them, which he has protested against as a yoke and a fetter when exerted by his Bishop toward himself. I wish this had occurred to some of my Reverend Brethren, who I believe are in the laudable habit of making pretty frequent appeals to their congregations in favour of some Societies, before they signed this document, and that they had reflected for a moment, that their signature must either stop their mouths on such oc-

casions, or convict them of the most glaring inconsistency. Finally, to complete this series of false pretences, the subscribers to the Declaration are made to profess a tender regard for the welfare of the Societies against which it is levelled. It represents them as suffering, or as in danger of incurring serious detriment from the favour which they receive. The issuing of such letters, it is alleged, "holds out an inducement to the Society to rest its claim to public support, not so much upon the importance of the work in which it is engaged, or the principles on which it rests, as upon the official patronage it may be able to secure." In the mouth of avowed enemies or strangers to our Church, such language would at least be consistent and intelligible. For they would be at liberty to assume, that the episcopal patronage is sought and given without respect either to the importance of the work in which the Society is engaged, or to the principles on which it rests. But it is not so clear how such a supposition can be made by clergymen with either justice or decency. And without it, that is, if the patronage is bestowed, not at random or from sinister motives, but just on account of the importance of the work, and in approbation of the principles on which the Society rests, it will be evident that this objection is as groundless as all those which precede it. But it is so contrived as to imply an imputation equally offensive to the Bishops whom the subscribers profess to respect, and to the Societies which they affect to befriend. I am ready however

to believe that they are not chargeable with any thing worse than thoughtlessness and rashness, or at the most that they have only been blinded by party spirit; and I neither know nor care to inquire, who are the real authors of that which I consider as a gross outrage on truth, decency, and common sense.

I have touched on the special claims of two out of the three Societies to which this Declaration relates. Those of the third, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, rest upon different ground. I have always felt it my duty to give whatever support I could contribute to its cause by my "official patronage," not only from my sense of the importance of its work, and my approbation of the principles by which it is governed, but also because I believe that its value and its merits are not duly appreciated in this Diocese. It seems to be commonly conceived, that the two Societies through which the Church discharges her missionary functions, are engaged in precisely the same work, but carry it on in somewhat different ways; and that the only question between them is, which way is to be preferred. It is not, I believe, sufficiently understood, that they are occupied with different tracts of the vast missionary field: but that the work of the elder Society is entitled to precedence, because it is that which has been most clearly assigned to us as a nation by Divine Providence, as a duty incident to that imperial sway with which we have been entrusted in so many regions of the earth. No missionary

efforts in any other direction, however wide their range, can make amends for the neglect of that duty. I will add that the recent events in the East, which have filled our hearts with grief and horror, while they so fearfully illustrate the hollowness and comparative worthlessness of all civilization which is not rooted in Christianity, serve in my opinion to strengthen the claims of a Society, which combines large views and active zeal with prudent moderation and calm discretion.

Which is the best plan of providing for this and other objects of Christian charity, is quite another question, one no less important than difficult, and which will, I trust, engage more and more of the attention of the Church, until it has found its true solution. But I will not dissemble my conviction, that none will be entirely satisfactory, which does not at least include among its elements a return to the primitive apostolical method of collection on the first day of the week. Other modes of drawing forth the resources of Christian charity may be, immediately, more productive. That any, or all of them together, would be so on the whole, and at the end of the reckoning, there is good reason to doubt, or rather utterly to disbelieve. But the others are all perfectly consistent with the regular use of this. Its peculiar advantage is, that there is no other which tends so directly and certainly to cherish the spirit which it calls into action. And in comparison with the benefit of nourishing and diffusing this spirit, the

actual amount of any pecuniary offering is quite insignificant. When that which is cast into the treasury of the Church is merely the conventional sign of a thing absent, when it is wrung from reluctant hands by the force of custom, and even when it is the produce of a transient emotion stirred by an eloquent appeal, it is of little worth in the sight of God, and even with regard to the end for which it is destined, its value is exactly measured by its quantity. But what calculation can estimate the preciousness of the gift which is brought to the altar as the thank-offering of a devout and cheerful heart! While the false token can yield no increase, this bears a stamp by which it represents a blessing beyond all price. Even in a far lower point of view, I am persuaded that no habit would be more beneficial both to rich and poor, than that, in conformity with the apostolical order, "every one should lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, on the first day of the week," for charitable and religious purposes.

And of this at least, my brethren, we may be well assured, that in such a spirit lies the strength and the hope of the Church. Its growth is the surest sign of her prosperity. Her life is not to be quickened by the heat of controversy, but by the fire of love. When that waxes cold, offences must multiply, and iniquity abound. And as the worst tendency of our unhappy divisions is to quench that spirit, so it alone can effectually remedy the other evils which spring from them. This is the surest test by which we can try

the other spirits, whether they be of God: the test therefore which we ought to be ever applying to our own. And while we pray that it may be more and more shed abroad in our hearts, let us try it also by its fruits, and beware that we never rest satisfied with any other proof of its presence, than a continual and progressive abounding in the work of the Lord.

APPENDIX.

(A.)

The Immaculate Conception.

It is to be regretted that whatever attention has been recently drawn to this subject among English Protestants, has been almost confined to its dogmatical side, and that the historical importance of the innovation, as it marks a new era in the constitution of the Papal Church, has been generally overlooked. The Abbé Laborde justly describes the ultimate object of the whole transaction, as a “coup d'état ecclésiastique, par où l'épiscopat devait demeurer anéanti” (p. 70, note). This view of the matter is strongly confirmed by Cardinal Gousset's collection of documents, which will be found extremely instructive by every one who is sufficiently interested in the question to examine its contents. The unanimity of the prelates, whose opinions he reports, on the tenet itself, is evidently in the Cardinal's eye a secondary point, in comparison with their belief in the individual infallibility of the Pope. He not only never fails to give the utmost possible prominence to every expression of that belief, but does not hesitate to assure the reader that it exists where it is not expressed. So p. 535, as to the Archbishop of Rouen, “quoiqu'il n'ait point déclaré formellement, qu'il s'en rapportait au jugement infaillible du Vicaire de Jésus-Christ, on n'a pu douter un instant de sa parfaite soumission à l'autorité du Pasteur Suprême de l'Eglise.” See p. 206, as to the Bishop of Chartres, and generally as to the construction to be put on the silence of the Bishops, p. 683; and the correction which he administers to the Bishop of Evreux, who had ventured not only to deprecate the definition of doctrine, but to qualify his

submission with the words, "Je déclare me soumettre au jugement du Saint Siège Apostolique *et de la majorité des Evêques.*" The Cardinal takes that occasion to observe (p. 272), that the judgment of the Apostolical See includes that of every Bishop who is in communion with the Church of Rome, Mother and Mistress of all the Churches. In the preface indeed he lays down the doctrine as already beyond controversy; though his anxiety to exhibit the testimonies of the prelates who incidentally profess their belief in it, betrays his consciousness that it stands in need of their suffrage. According to him, the authority of the Pope in matters of faith, far outweighs that of the whole Episcopate in Council, which, without the papal sanction, is null, and, with it, superfluous (p. iii.). But still it would seem, the vote of each Bishop, given in his closet, may contribute its share toward establishing that long disputed supremacy.

The Pope however, while he reserved the final decision of the question for his own infallible judgment, had condescended to consult his "Venerable Brethren" by his Circular issued from Gaeta. What that inquiry should have been, if it was to furnish a groundwork for a dogmatical decree, is well stated by Laborde, p. 90. "If," says the Abbé, "he had seriously wished to learn from every Bishop the faith of his Church, and his own episcopal judgment, he might have said, Let us know whether your Church holds and has always held the Immaculate Conception as an article of faith revealed in the Scriptures, preached by the Apostles, and handed down by the tradition of the Catholic Church. Judge this question canonically in council with your provincial Bishops, and in a regular synod; then send your judgment to me, that after having received the testimony and judgment of all the Churches, if this judgment is uniform, I may add my own to it, and declare that such is the faith and the judgment of the universal Church. But instead of this, the question proposed was as to the devotion of the Clergy and people of each Diocese with regard to the Immaculate Conception, and the sentiments and wishes of each Bishop (*ut majori qua fieri potest celeritate Nobis significare velit, qua devotione vester Clerus, Populusque fidelis erga Immaculatæ Virginis Conceptionem sit animatus, et quo desiderio flagret, ut ejusmodi res ab Apostolica Sede decernatur,*

atque imprimis quid Vos ipsi de re ipsâ sentiatis, quidque exoptetis)." According therefore to the Pope's view, the most important evidence that could be furnished by the voice of the whole Episcopate to guide or confirm his judgment, was the actual state of opinion and feeling on the subject. And, accordingly, several of the Bishops rely mainly on the present prevalence of the popular persuasion, as the chief ground of their own belief, and as capable of supplementing the acknowledged imperfection of the Scriptural and traditional testimony. (See especially the Letters of the Bishops of Majorca, p. 384, and Ferentino, p. 281.) The Abbé Laborde indeed (speaking it must be supposed of France) questions the alleged prevalence of the opinion among the Laity (p. 64), and with regard to the Clergy adds this remarkable statement: "As to the ecclesiastics, members of the monastic orders of either sex, priests, and even bishops, for the most part they do not count. In fact they profess to have no opinion of their own on any thing. According to the system of *blind obedience*, which is now in the ascendant, every one of them thinks, says, and preaches only what his superior bids him think, say, and preach, without troubling himself to know whether it is true. They would believe that they were guilty of mortal sin, if they had any conviction. *Cæci sunt, et duces cæcorum* (Matt. xv. 14). This system of blindness is the rule of the Jesuits, and the actual teaching of the seminaries."

But assuming the almost universal prevalence of the belief both among the Clergy and the Laity, we have to observe, that it is admitted on all hands to have been constantly spreading, especially in the few last centuries, until it reached its present extent of general reception. And it is no less clear from the documents supplied by Cardinal Gousset, that the present state of opinion on the subject is the result of a system, partly of violence and intimidation, partly of misrepresentation and delusion, which was carried on during the same period with increasing activity. Every expression of the adverse opinion was forbidden by the highest authority, and exposed every one who ventured upon it to personal danger. In Portugal (as the Pope is informed by the Bishop of Faro, p. 278) "the three Estates of the realm, in 1646, pledged themselves by oath to defend the Immaculate Conception even at

the peril of life, and decreed that whoever should dare to violate that vow and solemn oath, should, if a citizen, be immediately banished from the territory of the empire; if king, be exposed to the wrath of God and to their imprecation" (and as it would seem to the loss of his crown; for this appears to be signified by the words of the decree, 'et nostrorum seriem interrumpat'). Similar engagements were very common elsewhere. The Spanish ardour in the cause is well known (*propension innée des Espagnols*, according to the Bishop of Lugo, p. 374). It appears however from the letter of the Archbishop of Valencia (p. 640), that on the 8th of December, 1530, being the Festival of the Immaculate Conception, a preacher named Moner had ventured to maintain the contrary opinion in the pulpit of the cathedral of that city. The result was so great a scandal, that, to satisfy the demands of the Chapter, the indignation of the magistrates, and the tumultuous movements of the crowd, it was found necessary that very day to exile the rash orator (compare p. 497 and 841), and the next day to celebrate the Feast of the Immaculate Conception anew: and on this occasion all the members of the monastic orders who were present, took an oath to defend the glorious privilege of the Virgin both in public and private, to the utmost of their power; and it was resolved that in future no chair or diploma of the University should be granted to any one before he had taken the like oath. A statute to the same effect was passed by the Divinity Faculty in the University of Paris in 1496. The Universities of Coimbre, Manilla, Vienna, and Cologne (see Gousset under Lisbonne, Manilla, Vienna, and Cologne) exacted the like pledge, as did a great number of other learned bodies and cathedral chapters. On the whole, it is certain that to be suspected of holding a different opinion, or even of questioning the favourite doctrine, was for every one more or less unsafe and inconvenient, and for a clergyman a sure bar to preferment.

Again, the extent to which the popular ignorance and credulity has been abused, may be partly estimated from the unfeigned uneasiness expressed by some of the Bishops, lest the happy security of their flocks should be disturbed when they learnt for the first time that the question remained to be decided. So the Bishop of Santander (p. 559), "les simples fidèles vivaient avec une telle

securité dans cette croyance, que l'Encyclique était venue les troubler en quelque sorte, en leur faisant croire, que son objet était encore en question." So at Sinigaglia (p. 577): "beaucoup de fidèles ignoraient si la question avait été décidée ou non par l'Eglise, et si elle avait besoin de l'être." So at Sion in Switzerland: "le peuple jouissait paisiblement de sa pieuse croyance, au point qu'il aurait soupçonné d'hérésie le moindre doute, et qu'on aurait besoin d'user de précautions en lui annonçant la définition prochainement attendue, pour éviter de causer aux simples de l'étonnement et du trouble" (p. 580). So at Wurzburg (p. 674): "le peuple croit simplement cette vérité, comme il croit les dogmes de foi:" no doubt, just as the converts of the Sandwich Islands (p. 558): "quoique peu instruits des choses de la foi, n'éprouvent aucune difficulté à admettre cette croyance;" and at Tonquin Oriental (p. 610): "le clergé indigène et le peuple fidèle qui n'avaient aucune idée des controverses théologiques, n'éprouvaient ni doute ni hésitation dans leur croyance." But at German Spires also (p. 588): "ceux qui n'étaient pas initiés aux controverses théologiques la rangeaient au nombre des dogmes." At Spalatro (p. 587): "le peuple en était si pénétré, et avait tant de dévotion pour cette prérogative de Marie, qu'il avait fallu user de prudence en prescrivant les prières publiques selon les vues de l'Encyclique." At Sonora (p. 585): "Proposer au peuple cet article de foi, comme étant encore à définir, ce serait chose étrange à ses yeux. Ignorant les décrets des Souverains Pontifes à ce sujet, il traiterait d'impie et de blasphémateur quiconque avancerait une assertion en sens contraire." These examples might be multiplied. Compare the letters from Livourne, p. 368; Coire, p. 225; Cabu, p. 197; Casano, p. 191; Braga, p. 159; Albe-Royale, p. 46; Agria, p. 35. It is evident that this wide-spread error has been not only permitted, but studiously cherished and inculcated by the Clergy.

It was indeed a very natural, almost unavoidable, consequence of the devotional practices in which the people have been trained. It must be difficult for them to understand how the Church, by the authority of Popes and Councils, could sanction a Festival in honour of a doctrine which was only a pious opinion, and not an article of faith. And most of the Bishops themselves now refer to the Festival as one of the strongest proofs of the truth of the doc-

trine; mostly appearing to forget that the question proposed to them affected not its truth, but its certainty, as a dogma of the Church, and that this certainty could not be proved, or in the slightest degree confirmed, by the sanction which had been given to the celebration while the tenet was confessedly not an article of faith; though undoubtedly the argument implies a very grave and well-merited censure on all who had taken a share in so misdirecting the devotion of the people to an uncertain object. But Cardinal Gousset's volume discloses some rather curious facts with regard to the Festival itself, which will help to show how far it can serve to supply the absence of Scriptural and patristic authority. The antiquity of the observance is variously stated. The faithful people of Cadiz indeed (p. 169) claim it as one of their glories that the Festival had been celebrated in their cathedral from Apostolical times. But the Synod of Baltimore (p. 117) was not aware that it had been introduced in the West before the ninth century. And the English Romanists do not trace theirs farther back than the end of the eleventh (p. 669). But the more important question is as to the meaning or object of the Festival; for on this it must entirely depend whether it proves any thing even as to the relative antiquity of the belief which it is now alleged to confirm. The Bull *Ineffabilis* itself alludes to a diversity of opinion on this point, and states that the Popes had proscribed the opinion of those who affirmed that the Church did not intend by the Festival to celebrate the Conception, but only the Sanctification, of the Virgin. Which however of these interpretations is likely to have been the earlier and the more correct, may be safely left to the judgment of every intelligent and impartial reader. The Papal determination of the dispute can only be accepted as decisive by those who go to the extreme ultramontane length of asserting the Pope's infallibility even in matters of fact. The Bishop of Aversa still thinks it necessary to observe (p. 103), "that his Church, when it solemnly celebrates the Festival of the Immaculate Conception, does not propose merely to honour the dignity of the person who was chosen to be the Mother of the Son of God, but the sanctification of her soul in the first instant at which it was created and united to her mortal body." The Synod of Baltimore (p. 117) makes the curious remark, that

in the East the Festival was observed from the fifth century, under the title of the Conception of St. Anne, mother (according to a worthless legend) of the Holy Virgin. So that either St. Anne shared the privilege now attributed to St. Mary, or the title of the Festival in honour of St. Mary may have referred, not to her parentage, but to her maternity; as the Abbé Laborde justly remarks with regard to a large part of the quotations from the Fathers in the Bull: "les Pères y exaltent, par des éloges souvent figurés et hyperboliques, selon le genre oratoire, la saintété, l'innocence, la purété ineffable de la conception et de l'enfantement par lequel elle a conçu et enfanté le Sauveur, et non point du tout la conception par laquelle elle a été conçue elle-même, comme on l'assure frauduleusement dans ce passage de la bulle." It is in this point of view very remarkable, that the Armenian Archbishop Primate of Constantinople (p. 237), after asserting the universal belief of his nation in the Immaculate Conception, goes on to say, that, having carefully examined what the Armenian Fathers had thought of the question, he had found that, from the first ages of the Church, they confessed in the ecclesiastical hymns,—what? not the modern dogma, but the very doctrine which the Popes, as the Bull states, had *proscribed* as an erroneous interpretation of the object of the Festival, namely, "que la Vierge Marie a été bénie dans le sein de sa Mère, et qu'elle en est sortie exempte de toute tâche."

Among the various ways in which the belief has been impressed on the minds of the faithful, none is more notable than that described by the Bishop of Amalfi, who (p. 58) "faisait remarquer que son Eglise était en possession des restes mortels de Saint André, et il leur attribuait *une puissance persuasive en faveur du privilege du culte et de l'amour de l'Immaculée Conception.*" That a Bishop of Amalfi should be capable of such absurdity, or of superstition which can hardly be paralleled except in African Fetish worship, might not be surprising. But it is a French Cardinal, Archbishop of Rheims, who transcribes the remark, in utter unconsciousness that there is any thing in it ridiculous or offensive. The (pretended) epistle of the priests and deacons of Achaia, in which both the Bishop and the Cardinal himself find "a precious testimony in favour of the Immaculate

Conception," is just as irrelevant as the language of the hymns cited by the Armenian Primate.

The late Archbishop of Paris, M. Sibour, "after having consulted the ablest theologians of his diocese, and having himself most carefully examined and weighed the whole matter as in the Divine presence," arrived at the following conclusions:—"1st, That according to the principles of theology, the Immaculate Conception of the most Holy Virgin does not admit of being defined (*n'est pas définissable*) as a truth of Catholic faith (*comme vérité de foi catholique*), and in no case can be imposed as a belief binding under penalty of eternal damnation. 2nd, That a definition of any kind, even if the Church or the Holy See believed it had power to make one, would not be seasonable (*opportune*), for it would add nothing to the glory of the Immaculate Virgin, and might be detrimental to the peace of the Church, and the welfare of souls, especially in his diocese." The sole advantage which could result from the definition deprecated by M. Sibour, is very plainly stated by the Bishop of Valladolid, who wished for one. The answer which he received from his Clergy was this (p. 643), "*que tous tenaient à la pieuse croyance de l'Immaculée Conception, comme si déjà elle eût été rangée parmi les dogmes de la foi, et que sa définition solennelle ne leur apporterait désormais que le droit de reconnaître des hérétiques dans ceux qui pourraient s'en écarter.*" That was all they would gain by the definition: the right of denouncing as heretics all who might differ from them on this point. Therefore, as the Bishop assures the Pope, they would welcome the decree *with extreme joy*. For the same reason the Archbishop of Cuba, elected Archbishop of Burgos, was transported with delight by the prospect of this event (p. 253): "Oh! quel heureux jour, que celui où l'on entendra cet oracle du Siège Apostolique: Il faut croire que la Très-Sainte Mère de Dieu a été exempte de la tâche originelle, dont le genre humain a été souillé à cause du péché d'Adam. Celui qui ne croira pas que la Vierge, Mère de Dieu, a été conçue sans péché, *qu'il soit anathème*. Ce sera le jour que le Seigneur aura fait: *Nous nous réjouirons, et nous tressaillerons d'allégresse.*"

This would be bad enough in itself. But the worst is, that the same fiendish wickedness is, by direct necessary implication, im-

puted to the Blessed Virgin herself, for whose greater *honour and glory* the damnatory decree has been pronounced. May we not here more fitly apply the words of the Psalmist: "His delight was in cursing, and it shall happen unto him. He clothed himself with cursing like as with a raiment: and it shall come into his bowels like water, and like oil into his bones." A new right—not of believing, not of worshipping, for that existed before to the fullest extent, but—of cursing, of branding with heresy, is, so far as the faithful are concerned, the single result of the proceedings, which, from February, 1849, to December, 1854, appear to have occupied so large a part of the attention of the whole Roman Communion. The Abbé Laborde does not speak too strongly when he calls that which has been done at Rome, "*un véritable crime, dont rendront compte à Dieu ceux qui y ont participé*" (p. 74). Yet the perversion of moral feeling which it indicates is the smallest part of the evil or the sin. The final and complete centralization of all authority in the person of the Pope, the virtual absorption of the Episcopate in the Papacy, as it was probably the main object of the whole transaction, is certainly its most important and most pernicious effect. The nature of the occasion on which this power has been usurped, marks and determines the spirit in which it will be continually exercised. It may seem difficult to conceive that the state of Christianity can ever sink below that which is exhibited in Cardinal Gousset's volume. But it is certain that the malign influence of the spiritual despotism which has just reached its climax, will make itself felt more and more the longer it lasts. The recent triumph over historical truth, Christian charity, and ecclesiastical order, is no doubt only one of a long series yet to come. The debasement of Christianity, the extinction of all true spiritual life, must henceforward be progressive, and will probably manifest themselves in many still more extravagant and monstrous forms: but only until the designs of Providence shall be revealed upon this mystery of iniquity, which, however it may work and seemingly prosper for a season, is assuredly reserved for destruction in His appointed time.

(B.)

On the History of the Eucharistic Controversy.

MR. FREEMAN has shown so much ability and research in the first part of his work on the "Principles of Divine Service," that any opinions which he may advance in the course of it must carry great weight with his readers, and, if erroneous, will be likely to lead many astray. I am therefore sorry to be obliged to express my dissent from many of the statements contained in the Introduction to Part II. Its "design"—as he describes it in the *Monitum* prefixed to it—"is to unravel, by means of an historical survey of the ancient belief concerning the HOLY EUCHARIST, viewed as a mystery, and of the later departures from it, the manifold confusions which have grown up around the subject, more especially since the fatal epoch of the eleventh century." In this Introduction the author appears to me to have indulged in a licence of speculation for which I was not prepared by the sobriety of judgment which he shows in the first Part. But it is with his "historical survey" that I am at present concerned. I believe that it is not only incorrect in many particulars, but fundamentally erroneous, and that it places the great turning-point of the history of the Eucharistic controversy in a totally false light. He himself is aware that his view of the origin of the controversy is opposed to the generally received opinion: indeed he has not been able to cite any writer who agrees with him in it: though it may be questioned whether he knows the amount of authority which might be set in array against him, as I believe it includes every writer on the subject who deserves to be named. He is also conscious that his view is not only singular, but paradoxical. For he admits (p. 38) that "there is indeed at first sight a clear opposition" between two statements of doctrine, which he nevertheless holds to be consistent with each other. It is therefore the more to be lamented, that while standing thus absolutely alone on the most momentous point of the whole dis-

cussion—the origin of the controversy—he should have treated it so lightly and superficially as he has done, and should have propounded a paradoxical novelty with scarcely any ground to support it but his own naked assertion.

Mr. Freeman believes that the controversy first arose in the eleventh century, and not, as is generally supposed, in the ninth. His proposition is this: “It is commonly represented that controversy concerning the Eucharist commenced early in the ninth century; Paschasius Radbertus (in 820) on the one hand, and Ratramnus, Rabanus Maurus and others (840—850) on the other, having maintained diametrically opposite views upon the subject. But in truth, on a careful examination of their writings, no such opposition can be discovered. That the writers no where impugne each other by name, is confessed. And the views maintained by them respectively prove on enquiry to be no more than the carrying out of one or the other term of the Eucharistic mystery, as anciently held. On neither side is this accompanied by a denial of the other term.”

This is an assertion which must startle those who are even moderately conversant with the literature of the subject, and still more those who are in some degree at home in the circle of the Eucharistic ideas belonging to the period in question. If Mr. Freeman has been brought to his conclusion by a more “careful examination of the writings” to which he refers, than had been instituted by any of those who have gone before him, it is much to be lamented that he should not have thought it worth while to communicate the process as well as the result, instead of requiring his readers to take so important a point upon his sole authority, supported only by such very slight and worthless arguments as those which he has actually produced in the few pages which he has devoted to this part of his inquiry.

My own examination of the writings of Paschasius and Ratramn has led me to the opposite conclusion. I believe that it may be clearly shown from them, that the two lines of thought which Mr. Freeman represents as parallel, do in fact run directly counter to one another; that the doctrine of Paschasius differs from Transubstantiation in little more than the name: only falling short of the last stage of its development: while that of Ratramn

is the genuine doctrine of the Church of England, as opposed both to the Romish Transubstantiation and the Lutheran Co-subsistence.

Mr. Freeman believes his position to be strengthened by some external evidence, which may therefore deserve a preliminary remark. But I need only express my surprise, that he should for this purpose have seriously referred to the gross blunder by which Paschasius and Ratramn have been confounded with one another (p. 39). Whether there is any such identity (*ibid.*) in their language as to prevent any one who has carefully examined their writings from perceiving that their opinions are irreconcilably repugnant to each other, will be considered presently. But no doubt the "further and more convincing indication" of the alleged agreement which, as Mr. Freeman conceives, "is furnished by the silence of the Church at the time and for a long while after," is entitled to more attention; though, even if no other account could be given of it, its force as an argument would entirely depend on our ignorance of circumstances which might have enabled us to explain it. But it does not seem difficult to account for the fact otherwise. The gross carnal view maintained by Paschasius, was no doubt prevalent among the vulgar, whose belief was confirmed by such miracles as those which he reports in his treatise, c. 14. But it is evident from the questions proposed by King Charles to Ratramnus, as well as from his answer, that it was not yet generally received even among the more intelligent Laity, still less among the more learned of the Clergy. Even two centuries later, Hildebrand would fain have eluded the necessity of sanctioning it by the condemnation of Berengar. But by that time the tide had become too strong even for him. In the earlier period, the Popes were still able to preserve a discreet neutrality: the rather as Ratramn appears to have destined his treatise for the private reading of Charles the Bald, avoided all personal allusion to Paschasius, who was his abbot at Corbey, and—conscious no doubt that he was on the unpopular side—shrank from publicity (see Lauf in the *Stud. and Krit.* 1828, p. 775). All this however is, as much as Mr. Freeman's inference from the "silence of the Church," matter of surmise, which ought not of itself to appear "convincing" to any one. The main question is, whether these

two writers have expressed themselves so obscurely and ambiguously, that it is impossible to ascertain their meaning from their own language. And first, as to Paschasius.

Mr. Freeman (p. 36) denies that "Paschasius affirmed the annihilation of the elements in their proper nature." He acknowledges that the contrary "opinion has very widely prevailed:" but among the authors who have held it, he only notices the most ancient and the most modern: Berengarius and Dean Milman. Both, he thinks, were mistaken, and Dean Milman "probably misled by the authority of Berengarius:" who "overstates the view of Paschasius." On this I must observe that, if Dean Milman deferred to the authority of Berengarius, he acted both modestly and wisely, and as became a writer of Ecclesiastical History. For Berengarius was, by his familiarity with the mediæval language and trains of thought, incomparably better qualified to understand the meaning of Paschasius than any scholar at this day, and could be under no temptation needlessly to rank so eminent a person among his opponents. Mr. Freeman's assertion, that the doctrine which Berengarius attributes to Paschasius, "does not appear in his regular treatise on the subject," is just the point which we have to examine, and on which I believe Mr. Freeman to have been "misled," in opposition to the highest authority, by his preconceived theory. He also thinks that on this point he has Bishop Cosin on his side. And, indeed, the Bishop ventured to assert (Hist. of Trans. p. 117) that "in that whole book of Paschasius there is nothing that favours the transubstantiation of the bread, or its destruction or removal:" and that "he hath many things repugnant to transubstantiation." And of these things he gives several specimens. But if his extracts proved any thing, they would prove a great deal too much for the purpose: namely, that transubstantiation is not now a doctrine of the Church of Rome. For all turn upon the words *spiritual* and *spiritually*. But these are admitted by Bellarmine to be applicable to the presence of Christ's body in the Eucharist (De Eccl. i. c. 2, "Non habet Christus in Eucharistia modum existendi corporum, sed potius spirituum, cum sit totus in qualibet parte. Itaque dicemus, Christum esse in Eucharistia vere, realiter, substantialiter, sed non dicemus corporaliter. Immo

contra dici posset esse spiritualiter, ut Bernardus dicit in Sermone de S. Martino, ubi affirmat in Sacramento exhiberi nobis veram carnis substantiam, sed spiritualiter, non carnaliter: tamen non videtur hæc vox multum frequentanda, quia periculum esset ne traheretur ab adversariis non tam ad modum quam ad ipsam naturam significandam: propter quod item periculum non videtur valde usurpandum illud, *non esse corporaliter*, nisi addatur continuo explicatio"). From this we may judge of the value of the statement with which the Bishop sums up the import of his extracts: "In these he teacheth, that the mystery of the Lord's Supper is not, and ought not to be, understood carnally, but spiritually: and that this dream of corporal and oral transubstantiation was unknown to the ancient Church." Bishop Cosin also treats the chapter (14) which contains the legendary miracles as "a spurious interpolation," added "by the craft of some superstitious forger," though its intimate connexion with the chapter immediately preceding, and the reference to the Jewish tradition about the manna, related in the third chapter, seem sufficiently to prove its genuineness, which Mr. Freeman does not dispute, but considers these stories as "illustrations," "of themselves proving that he conceived Christ's body to be present under a veil and in a mystery."

Mr. Freeman bids his readers "see the Treatise De Corpore throughout" (note *d*, p. 37), but he has himself quoted only three very short passages. Of these the first is, as he admits, an "approach to a denial of the existence of the elements," and therefore, as far as it goes, makes not for, but against his opinion. The second he has, as I shall show, entirely misunderstood. And the third will be found equally unavailable for his purpose. As this is all he has produced, I will consider each of them successively before I proceed to the positive part of my proof.

The first had been quoted by the Oxford editor of Bishop Cosin's "History of Transubstantiation" (p. 116), with the remark, that "though nearly approaching, it hardly amounts to the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation." Mr. Freeman says: "The nearest approach to a denial of the existence of the elements in Paschasius is in his first chapter, '*Licet figura panis et vini maneat, hæc nihil aliud quam caro Christi et sanguis post consecrationem cre-*

denda sunt.' But this may well mean that the outward visible elements are really the Body and Blood, and nothing less. And Ratramn himself says the same: 'Post mysticam consecrationem nec panis jam dicitur nec vinum, sed Christi corpus et sanguis.'" It may be as well to give the passage with a little of the context, according to the reading of Sirmondus in the Paris edition of 1618. After some general statements on the Divine omnipotence, Paschasius proceeds: "Et ideo nullus moveatur de hoc corpore Christi et sanguine, quod in mysterio vera sit caro et verus sanguis: dum sic ille voluit qui creavit. Omnia enim quaecumque voluit Dominus fecit, in cœlo et in terra. Et quia voluit, licet in figura panis et vini hæc sic esse [i. licet in figura panis et vini, hæc sic esse], omnino nihil aliud quam caro Christi et sanguis post consecrationem credenda sunt." The Oxford editor, who reads "licet figura panis et vini hic sit," prints *credenda* in italics, apparently intending to suggest, that Paschasius might mean that the bread and wine became the Body and Blood only to the apprehension of faith. But when Mr. Freeman asserts that *nihil aliud* in this passage may "well mean" *nothing less*, he is bound, I think, at least to show that such an interpretation is warranted by the usage of the period, and was that which would be likely to occur to the minds of the readers of Paschasius. That such was not the case appears, as I think, very clearly from the following passage of Berengarius (*De Sacra Cœna*, Berolini, 1834, p. 109): "Omnis enim qui *nihil aliud* esse confirmat post consecrationem panis in altari, quam portiunculam carnis Christi, panem altaris per consecrationem absumi secundum subjecti corruptionem astruit, et si *nihil aliud* est in altari, nisi carnis Christi portiuncula sensualis, non mentitur, qui dicit, post absumptum sensualiter panem esse solummodo corpus Christi in altari." That is, in the opinion of Berengarius, Paschasius could not have used such language, unless he had meant to say that, after consecration, the elements ceased to exist in their proper nature. To him *nihil aliud* is the exact equivalent of *solummodo*. Whether, however, this is "the nearest approach to a denial of the existence of the elements in Paschasius," and whether "Ratramn himself says the same," we shall see presently.

In the second of the three passages Mr. Freeman has fallen into

error for want of sufficient attention to his own direction: "See the Treatise De Corpore *throughout*." If he had not considered the words which he quotes by themselves, but in connexion with other parts of the treatise, he would have seen that they have an entirely different meaning from that which he attributes to them, and, in fact, imply exactly the reverse of it. "Paschasius," he says (p. 37, note *d*), "affirms, in clear contradiction to the doctrine which obtained in the eleventh century, that 'Christum fas vorari dentibus non est.'" The words occur in c. 4. And even the immediate context might have led him to doubt the soundness of his interpretation. It runs thus: "Utique et panis qui de cœlo descendit verus panis. Sed quia Christum vorari fas dentibus non est, voluit in mysterio hunc panem et vinum vere carnem suam et sanguinem consecratione Spiritus Sancti potentialiter creari; creando vero quotidie pro mundi vita mystice immolari, ut sicut de virgine per Spiritum vera caro sine coitu creatur, ita per eundem ex substantia panis ac vini mystice idem Christi corpus et sanguis consecratur." No doubt, according to Paschasius, Christ may not be devoured with the teeth; but his real natural flesh may. And how this comes to pass is clearly explained in the twelfth chapter. He there shows that although Christ himself, having entered once for all into the heavenly places, remains there a High Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec, his flesh possesses an inexhaustible productivity, through which, by the power of the Divine word, it may and does multiply itself. "Verbo enim Patris dictum est, *Crescite et multiplicamini*, et ecce adhuc hodie ex eo cuncta creantur animantia, non nova, sed ex eodem semine. Ita et caro Christi eodem verbo fit caro, quo Verbum caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis. Unde si ex illa benedictione tanta manat multitudo, quid putas ex carne Christi? Nunquid inefficax est ex se, qui tanta fecit ex nihilo? Et sicut panes auxit ex nihilo quantitate substantiæ, quam naturæ non dederat: nunquid impotens est facere ex aliquo, quod sine semine in utero creaverat? *Pullulat ergo illa ubertas carnis Christi, et manet integer Christus*: quia natura manente integra, etiam in creaturis ad jussu ejus cuncta exuberant. Propterea licet semel dixerit, *Germinet terra herbam virentem*, adhuc hodie ex eo quæ per singulos nascuntur annos omnia creantur. Sic utique et in eo quod semel voluit, et

deinceps carnem et sanguinem in hac commemoratione jussit esse, fit quod jubetur." It is evident from this that, according to the view of Paschasius, although, or rather because, Christ himself remains for ever in heaven entire and untouched, his very natural flesh may be, and in the Eucharist always is, eaten upon earth; and therefore that the assertion, "Christum vorari fas dentibus non est," does not "contradict," but is perfectly consistent with "the doctrine which obtained in the eleventh century:" "Christi corpus sensualiter sacerdotum manibus tangi et frangi."

The third passage, also from c. 4, is quoted by Mr. Freeman as confirming his inference from that which has been just examined. "So again, 'Veram carnem et verum sanguinem, sed *mystice*: mysticum est sacramentum nec *figuram* illud negare possumus.' Ratramn himself could not say more." I am obliged to say, that this remark as to Ratramn is not only frivolous and irrelevant, but must mislead the reader who relies on Mr. Freeman's authority as to the nature of the question. Ratramn might certainly have used the same language, but he would have required that it should be understood in his own sense, and not in that of Paschasius. Neither Paschasius nor Ratramn has left room for any reasonable doubt as to the meaning which each of them attached to the terms *veritas* and *figura* in the Eucharist. And I shall show that their views are so directly opposed to each other, that what to the one is the reality, is to the other the figure, and vice versâ. That there was something of *mystery* and *figure* in the Sacrament, followed from the nature of the thing, according to every account that could be given of it, and particularly from that of Paschasius himself in the preceding chapter, where he discusses the question: "*Quid sint sacramenta, vel quare dicantur.*" This therefore is quite independent of any particular speculation on the import of the mystery. It is common neutral ground, which may and must be taken by those who are most completely at variance with one another in their doctrine of the Sacraments. But it will be still more apparent how little the words quoted by Mr. Freeman can serve any purpose of his argument, when they are set down with the context which he has omitted. The passage from which they are extracted follows immediately after that which I have already transcribed, in which Paschasius affirms, as

we have seen, that the same Body and Blood of Christ which were created from the Virgin through the Spirit, are through the same Spirit mystically consecrated (that is, formed by consecration) out of the substance of bread and wine. And he then proceeds with another quotation from our Lord's discourse at Capernaum: "*De qua videlicet carne ac sanguine, Amen, amen, inquit, dico vobis, nisi manducaveritis carnem filii hominis, et biberitis ejus sanguinem, non habebitis vitam æternam in vobis. Ubi profecto non aliam quam veram carnem dicit, et verum sanguinem; licet mystice. Unde quia mysticum est Sacramentum, nec figuram illud negare possumus.*" That is, our Lord's words are to be taken literally, but yet not according to the error of the Capernautes, but with reference to the Sacrament, and therefore mystically and in a figure. How can it be gathered from this that Paschasius did not hold the annihilation of the elements? That he really did so, I shall now endeavour to prove; and by a method which will at least be admitted to be more satisfactory, and more likely to lead to the discovery of the truth, than that which has been adopted by Mr. Freeman. For I shall not, like him, content myself with two or three detached passages,—though those which I shall produce will, I trust, appear more to the point than any to which he has referred,—but shall endeavour to show that the doctrine in question is so involved in the whole argument of Paschasius, that several entire chapters of his treatise would be absurd and unintelligible on any other supposition.

I have already incidentally quoted some expressions which are, as I think, a much nearer "approach to a denial of the existence of the elements," than that which has been selected by Mr. Freeman as alone worthy of notice, where all depends on the literal sense of *nihil aliud*. Such are those in c. 4, where the Body and Blood are said to be created out of the substance of the bread and wine; or, in precisely the same sense, the bread and wine are said to be created the Body and Blood by consecration through the power of the Holy Ghost. When we remember that this creation is repeatedly compared by Paschasius to the miracle of the Incarnation, it must be evident that in his system it implies the abolition of the substance out of which the new substance is formed. A little farther on in the same chapter, in his explanation

of *veritas* as opposed to *figura* in the Sacrament, he varies his phrase, so as perhaps to make the meaning still clearer: "Veritas est, dum corpus Christi et sanguis virtute Spiritus in verbo ipsius ex panis vinique substantia efficitur." How could he have used such language, if he supposed the bread and wine to remain physically unchanged? But there are passages still stronger than these, where the change is expressly affirmed. One occurs (c. 2) in his mystical interpretation of a passage of Leviticus, where he says that the words (Levit. xxii. 14) signify one, "qui advertat omnem sanctificationem mystici sacrificii, et efficaciam, quomodo sensibilis res intelligibiliter virtute Dei per verbum Christi in carnem ipsius ac sanguinem divinitus *transferatur*." *Intelligibiliter*, because the change, though real, was not perceptible by the senses, but not the less implying that the elements which underwent the change ceased to exist in their proper nature. Again (c. 8), "Cogita igitur si quidpiam corporeum potest esse sublimius, cum substantia panis et vini in Christi carnem et sanguinem efficaciter interius commutatur, ita ut deinceps post consecrationem vera Christi caro et sanguis veraciter credatur et non aliud quam Christus panis de cœlo a credentibus æstimetur." It seems hardly possible to "approach" nearer than this to "a denial of the existence of the elements," without the technical term transubstantiation which however could scarcely be defined better, than as that change by which "*substantia panis et vini in Christi carnem et sanguinem commutatur*."

I proceed to that which I consider as the more cogent, if I may not say the absolutely conclusive and irresistible proof of my position. Mr. Freeman thinks that "the immediate design of the treatise of Paschasius was" only "to affirm that the Body and Blood which our Lord meant when He instituted the Eucharist, were no other than those which He gave for our redemption on the cross," but that, although "his language to this effect is strong, with a tendency towards the merely physical," "he confines himself to the positive statement of that side of the mystery with which he is dealing," and does not mean to reject the other, "by denying the existence of the material elements" after consecration. But to one who reads the treatise with this notion of the author's doctrine, how strange must appear the heading of the

thirteenth chapter: "Ut quid hæc colorem et saporem in Sacramento minime permutant," the inquiry why the elements undergo no change in colour or taste. Surely, if they remained in "their proper nature," the wonder would be if they did not retain their sensible qualities. And when we look into the contents of the chapter, we find that the object for which this was so ordained is stated to be twofold: to conceal the mystery from the profane gaze of unbelievers; and to enhance the merit of faith, and quicken the longings of the faithful for the full manifestation, and eternal fruition of Christ: "ita ut et veritas non desit in Sacramento, et ridiculum nullum fiat paganis, quod cruorem occisi hominis bibamus. Avidius enim requiritur quod latet, et preciosius est, quod cum fide quæritur. Ideo quoque sic debuit hoc mysterium temperari, ut et arcana secretorum celarentur infidis, et meritum cresceret de virtute fidei, et nihil deesset interius vere credentibus promissæ veritatis. Insuper et quod majus est, per hæc secretius præstita ad illam tenderent speciem satietatis, ubi jam non pro peccatis nostris quotidie Christus immolabitur, sed satietate manifestationis ejus sine ulla corruptione omnes sine fine fruemur." The end of concealment would indeed be equally attained, whether the elements did or did not continue to exist in their proper nature, so long as they presented the same sensible appearance. But it could be no trial of faith, that bread and wine looked and tasted like bread and wine, and not like flesh and blood. On the contrary, it would have been a stupendous miracle if they had done so. But if, as we have seen Paschasius repeatedly affirming to be the fact, the substance of the bread and wine had been changed into the real flesh and blood of Christ, then it was very natural to inquire why the change went no farther, and left the outward appearance, the colour and taste, of the transmuted elements unaltered? And this it is the object of the chapter to explain.

The same thing appears even more plainly from the sixteenth chapter, in which Paschasius discusses another question, which must sound very strange to one who takes Mr. Freeman's view of the subject. For it is, whether this body after consecration may be rightly called bread. "Utrum hoc corpus post consecrationem panis jure queat vocari." It is clear from the terms of the question,

that Paschasius did not conceive more than one substance to be present in the Sacrament of the Body, namely, the very Flesh of Christ. If he had believed that bread existed along with it, it would have been needless to raise such a question, as there would have been no difficulty to be solved. But if the bread had ceased to exist, there was good reason to inquire, whether the Body which had been created in its room, could be rightly called by the same name. But at all events, according to Mr. Freeman's view, the answer to such a question should have been an explanation of the distinction between the two co-existing substances, and of the synecdoché by which both together might be properly described by the name of either. But how totally different from this is the answer which Paschasius really gives! He starts from the fact that the name of *bread* is actually given to the Sacrament by St. Paul, and then proceeds to show in what sense this is to be understood; and it is, not as Mr. Freeman would have said, because the existence of the bread is "one side of the mystery," but because the Flesh of Christ is itself the living Bread which came down from heaven. And he goes on to say, that the Blood may in like manner be figuratively (*typicè*) called wine; not because there is really wine in the cup, but because it is the property of wine to gladden the heart of man. "Quod panis etiam, quamvis vera caro sit, hoc mysterium possit nominari, probat Apostolus ubi dicit, *Probat se homo, et sic de pane illo edat et de calice bibat, quia Christi caro et vera caro, et tamen panis vivus qui de cœlo descendit jure catholice prædicatur. Caro quidem secundum gratiam, panis vero secundum efficientiam, quia sicut hic panis terrenus vitam subministrat temporalem, ita ille cœlestis vitam præstat æternam et cœlestem, quia vita est sempiterna. Denique et sanguis hic secundum efficientiam simili modo vinum typicè potest vocari: quia sicut vinum lætificat cor hominum sobrietate, ita longe locupletius hoc vinum sanguinis lætificat cor hominis interioris et inebriat mentem amore spiritali.*" If there could be a shadow of doubt about the meaning of this language, it would be removed by the fact, that the view here expounded is precisely that of Humbert and Lanfranc. Lanfranc, *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, c. 8: "Confitetur Ecclesia toto orbe terrarum diffusa, panem et vinum ad sacrandum proponi in altari: sed inter sacrandum incomprehensibiliter et ineffabiliter in sub-

stantiam carnis et sanguinis commutari. Non tamen panem negat, immo confirmat. Sed panem qui de cœlo descendit, et dat vitam mundo: . . . Vinum quoque non qualecunque, sed quod hominum, non quidem omnium, sed servorum Dei corda lætificat, quod animas inebriat, et a peccatis purgat." To which Berengarius replies (p. 113 and foll. of the Berlin edition. Compare especially p. 125): "*Illud insistendum, quod vere beatus Ambrosius in eo libello sentiat, non deesse secundum sua subjecta mensæ dominicæ non panem qui de cœlo descendit quod dicitur tropice corpus Christi, quo tu sophisticè contendis elabi, sed panem, qui de pistrino venit ad communem aut dominicam mensam, qui propria locutione dicitur panis non tropica, et non vinum qui lætificat cor, quod dicitur Christi sanguis similiter locutione tropica, sed vinum quod non tropica locutione dicitur vinum, quod de torculari ad communem paratur vel ad dominicum calicem.*" It was, in the opinion of Berengarius, a sophistical evasion of a difficulty which pressed on the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

Mr. Freeman deals with Ratramn in the same easy, but very unsafe and unsatisfactory way as with Paschasius; citing a very few passages, or rather phrases, ambiguous in themselves, and detached from the context, which can alone determine their precise meaning. And he is so unfortunate, even in this very scanty selection, that two of his extracts are taken from a chapter (28) which contains, as we shall see, one of the clearest illustrations of that "direct contrariety and incompatibility" which he denies to exist between the views of Paschasius and Ratramn. But I believe that he has not only failed to produce any sufficient evidence of his assertion, but has misapprehended the state of the question as proposed by Ratramn, the general drift of his argument, and the master thought of the treatise. He says first: "The treatise of Ratramn however proves that there were some at that time who represented that the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist were discernible by the senses." If so, the darkness of "that time" must have been grosser than it had ever before entered into the mind of any one, however disposed to look down with contempt on the mediæval intellect, to imagine. But Mr. Freeman only makes this statement to withdraw it in the next sentence, and he shows in the same paragraph, that the treatise not only does not "prove" this, but proves that it was impossible; for, as

he truly observes, "Ratramnus appeals to the evidence of the senses as decisive, *by universal admission*, of the reality of the elements;" that is, of their sensible properties, form, colour, taste, and smell (c. 9 and 10, "exterius quidem panis, quod ante fuerat, forma pretenditur, color ostenditur, sapor accipitur. Gusta, vinum sapit: odora, vinum redolet: inspice, vini color intuetur. . . . Hæc ita esse nemo potest abnegare"). "But," Mr. Freeman proceeds, "they seem to have dreamed not so much of the natural Body and Blood being exhibited in their natural condition, as of a new Body and Blood, consisting of bread—a 'corpus panaceum'—and wine; so that there was no veiling or mystery, no outward and inward part." The "dream" therefore, instead of being, as would have appeared from the preceding sentence, a mere hallucination, was the opinion, that the bread and wine remained after consecration physically unchanged, but nevertheless became, in some sense, the Body and Blood of Christ; an opinion, which so far from being gainsayed by the treatise, was the belief of Ratramn himself, and is that of the Church of England. But when Mr. Freeman adds, "so that there was no veiling or mystery, no outward or inward part," this is quite another thing; not a necessary consequence of that opinion, but a proposition which both Ratramn and the Church of England utterly deny.

All this can only serve to divert attention from the real object of the treatise, which is at the same time to answer the two questions proposed by the King, and to refute the two propositions advanced by Paschasius at the outset of his work, to which those questions manifestly refer. Paschasius had affirmed (c. 1), "Quia voluit, licet in figura panis et vini, hæc sic esse, omnino nihil aliud quam caro Christi et sanguis post consecrationem credenda sunt. Unde ipsa Veritas ad discipulos *Hæc*, inquit, *caro mea est pro mundi vita.*" This, with the subsequent fuller and more definite statements to the same effect, several of which have been already cited, suggested the first of the two questions, which is thus stated by Ratramn (c. 5): "Quod in Ecclesia ore fidelium sumitur Corpus et Sanguis Christi, quærit Vestræ Magnitudinis Excellentia, in mysterio fiat an in veritate." I pass over, for the present, the farther explanation of the question, introduced by *id est*, which unfortunately is so worded as itself to stand in great

need of elucidation. Paschasius proceeds: "Et, ut mirabilis loquar, non alia plane quam quæ nata est de Maria, et passa in cruce, et resurrexit de sepulchro." This raises the second question, thus stated by Ratramn: "et utrum ipsum Corpus sit, quod de Maria natum est, et passum, mortuum, et sepultum, quodque resurgens et cœlos ascendens, ad dexteram Patris considerat."

The explanation of the first question, subjoined to the *id est*, runs thus: "Utrum aliquid secreti contineat quod oculis solummodo fidei pateat; an sine cujuscunque relatione mysterii hoc aspectus intueatur corporis exterius, quod mentis visus aspiciat interius, ut totum, quod agitur, in manifestationis luce clarescat." I will just remark that the Oxford editor, whose translation is in general much better than that of Canon Hopkins, has not observed that *aspectus corporis* corresponds to *mentis visus*, and was correctly rendered by Hopkins, "bodily sight." But the whole paraphrase is no doubt very obscure, and can only be understood by reference to the definitions which follow of *Figura* and *Veritas*. With regard to these, Mr. Freeman observes (note *h*, p. 38) on the word *figuratè* in c. 10 ("claret quia panis illa vinumque *figuratè* Christi Corpus et Sanguis existit"), "He does not mean unreally or metaphorically, but under another, which he elsewhere calls a spiritual, manner of being. So he explains *figura* l. c." This reference is certainly candid, almost to naïveté. For when we turn to Ratramn's definitions of *figura* and *veritas*, we find that, so far from confirming Mr. Freeman's assertion, they relate entirely to the distinction between metaphorical and literal language. "Figura," he says (c. 7), "est obumbratio quædam, quibusdam velaminibus quod intendit ostendens." So far he might be speaking either of a type or a metaphor. But what follows makes it unmistakably evident that he means a *figure of speech*. "Verbi gratia, Verbum volentes *dicere* Panem *nuncupamus*: sicut in oratione Dominica 'panem quotidianum dari nobis' expostulamus; vel cum Christus in Evangelio *loquitur dicens*, 'Ego sum Panis vivus, qui de cœlo descendit,' vel cum Scipsum Vitem, discipulos autem Palmites *appellat*. 'Ego sum,' *dicens*, 'Vitis vera, vos autem Palmites; hæc enim omnia *aliud dicunt et aliud innuunt*.'" This is the explanation which Mr. Freeman considers as a proof, that by *figuratè* Ratramn "does not mean metaphorically," but

“under another manner of being.” And in perfect conformity with this is the explanation of *veritas*. “*Veritas vero est rei manifestæ demonstratio, nullis umbrarum imaginibus obvelatæ, sed puris et apertis, utque planius eloquamur, naturalibus significationibus insinuatæ.*” Here again, so far, the meaning is undetermined; but what follows shows that the author is speaking of *language*: for he goes on: “*utpote cum dicitur Christus natus de Virgine, passus, crucifixus, mortuus et sepultus; nihil enim hic figuris obvelantibus adumbratur, verum rei veritas naturalium significationibus verborum ostenditur, neque aliud hic licet intelligi quam dicitur.* At in superioribus non ita; nam substantialiter nec Panis Christus, nec Vitis Christus, nec Palmites Apostoli. Quapropter hic Figura, superius vero Veritas in narratione monstratur, id est, nuda et aperta significatio.”

I have transcribed these two definitions in full, that the reader may compare them with the terms in which Ratramn states the first of the two questions. And I think it must now be clear what is the real import of that long circumlocution with which he explains what he meant by *in mysterio fiat an in veritate*. The question was, whether the expression *Corpus et Sanguis Christi* was to be understood literally or figuratively. Paschasius had maintained the literal interpretation of the words, and consequently the natural reality of the Body and Blood created out of the substance of the bread and wine. Ratramn contends for the figurative interpretation, according to which the bread and wine undergo no other than a relative change, becoming the Body and Blood only in spiritual significance and efficacy. The contrast between the two views which Mr. Freeman represents as harmonizing with one another, is as complete as can well be conceived. To Paschasius the Sacrament is, *in veritate*, in the literal sense of the words, the Body and Blood of Christ: figuratively, it is bread and wine. To Ratramn, on the contrary, it is bread and wine *in veritate*, the Body and Blood, figuratè.

But Mr. Freeman has cited (note *h*, p. 38) three passages, one from c. 9, two from c. 28, as containing “clear expressions, which are as strong as any thing Paschasius says,” by which we must judge of Ratramn’s meaning when he speaks of the bread as “the figure of Christ’s Body, and the like expressions.” The passages

are: "Panis per sacerdotis ministerium Christi corpus conficitur c. 9. Non enim putamus ullum fidelium dubitare, panem illum fuisse Christi corpus effectum:" and "Panis substantiam et vini creaturam convertere potuit in proprium corpus." It is only fair to Mr. Freeman to remark, that the Magdeburg centuriators were also struck by Ratramn's use of the term *convertere*, and observed (as they are triumphantly quoted by D'Achery, Spic. i. p. 52), "Transubstantiationis habet semina Bertramus, utitur enim vocabulis *commutationis* et *conversionis*." On the other hand, it might have occurred to him to reflect, that if there was any force in this expression apart from the context, it would prove that Berengarius also perfectly agreed with Lanfranc. For he says (p. 161, ed. Berolin.), "Est vera procul dubio panis et vini per consecrationem altaris conversio in corpus Christi et sanguinem:" which, if we look no farther, is surely as "clear" and "as strong as any thing" Lanfranc says, being, in fact, an echo of his words. But then Berengarius proceeds to distinguish: "Sed attendendum, quod dicitur per consecrationem, quia hic est hujus conversionis modus:" that is, as he explains by numerous examples in the context, a purely relative change. And therefore it is equally necessary to look a little farther in Ratramn's context before we can be sure whether he means the same kind of change as Paschasius. And the context is this: "Sicut ergo paulo antequam pateretur, panis substantiam, et vini creaturam convertere potuit in proprium Corpus quod passurum erat, et in Suum Sanguinem, qui post fundendus extabat, sic etiam in deserto manna et aquam de petra in Suam Carnem et Sanguinem convertere prævaluit, quamvis longe post et Caro Illius pro nobis in cruce pendenda, et Sanguis Ejus in ablutionem nostram fundendus superabat." So that it turns out that the change signified by this "clear and strong expression" is no other than that which took place (according to Ratramn's interpretation of St. Paul's language, 1 Cor. x. 1—4, which he has been expounding in several preceding chapters) in the manna and water, by which they were made the vehicles of spiritual nourishment. And he describes this nourishment still more plainly in c. 26, where, commenting on the words of the Psalm lxxviii. 25, "Panem angelorum manducavit homo," he says, "ostendit certe Psalmista, quid patres nostri in illo

manna cœlesti perceperint, vel quid fideles in mysterio Christi credere debeant. In utroque certe Christus innuitur, qui et credentium animas pascit, et Angelorum cibus existit. Utrumque hoc non corporeo gustu, nec corporali sagina, sed spiritualis Verbi virtute." Paschasius took a totally different view of this subject, which he explains in the fifth chapter of his treatise. He considered the manna as a type of the Sacrament: "Manna spiritualiter percipientibus typus fuit escæ corporis Christi, et aqua illa quæ de petra fluxerat figura sanguinis. Siquidem in præfiguratione idem, sed non idem in adimpletione veritatis." Here again, we see, that what to the one was *figura*, was to the other *veritas*. Ratramn again illustrates his view of the subject by reference to Baptism. Consecration effects no other kind of change in the bread and wine of the Eucharist than in the water of the Font (c. 17—19). In each case the material element becomes the vehicle of a spiritual power ("spiritualis potentia," c. 21). This power or virtue he is constantly insisting upon, as that by which alone the Sacrament differs from the unconsecrated elements. And this is the doctrine against which Paschasius vehemently protests in his Commentary on S. Matthew (c. xxvi.) and his Letter to Frudegard, and with an evident reference to Ratramn's treatise: "Miror quid velint nunc quidam dicere, non in re esse veritatem carnis Christi vel sanguinis, sed in Sacramento *virtutem* quandam carnis, et non carnem, *virtutem* sanguinis et non sanguinem; *figuram et non veritatem*, umbram et non corpus." A direct antithesis to the proposition with which Ratramn sums up his answer to the first question, c. 49: "Corpus et Sanguis Christi quæ fidelium ore in Ecclesia percipiuntur, figuræ sunt secundum speciem visibilem. At vero secundum invisibilem substantiam, id est, divini *potentiam* Verbi, vere Corpus et Sanguis Christi existunt. Unde secundum visibilem creaturam corpus pascunt, juxta vero potentioris *virtutem* substantiæ, fidelium mentes et pascunt et sanctificant."

With regard to the second question, Mr. Freeman admits that "there is at first sight a clear opposition" between Paschasius and Ratramn, "the one asserting that the Body received in the Eucharist is the same which Christ had on earth, and gave for our redemption; the other, that it is not. But when they come to

explain themselves, they clearly show that what they both alike believed was a different mode of manifestation or existence of the same Body." I believe they have explained themselves clearly enough to prove that neither of them would have accepted the compromise by which Mr. Freeman seeks to reconcile them with one another. Neither of them held that there was more than one substance in the Sacrament. This was believed by Paschasius to be the very Body and Blood of Christ, though not manifested to the senses, but veiled under what were afterwards called the accidents of bread and wine. Ratramn, on the contrary, believed that the bread and wine remained after consecration without any change but the accession of a new spiritual efficacy, which he describes as the power of the Divine Word, which not only feeds but purifies the soul (c. 64): "Divini potentia Verbi quæ non solum animas pascit, verum etiam purgat." It is true Paschasius conceived the Flesh and Blood of Christ to be endued with a spiritual virtue, though still they could only profit those who eat and drink of them spiritually (c. 6): "Alius carnem Christi spiritualiter manducat et sanguinem bibit; alius vero non, quamvis buccellam de manu sacerdotis videatur percipere . . . non utique sibi carnem utiliter et sanguinem, sed iudicium." But this does not bring his doctrine nearer to that of Ratramn, if it may not be said to widen the distance between them. But the question between them is as to the nature of the thing contained in the Sacrament, not, as Mr. Freeman represents, as to the "mode of its manifestation or existence." Paschasius asserted this thing to be the very natural Flesh and Blood of Christ; and hence he teaches that Christ now dwells in us, not merely by harmony of will, but by nature (c. 9, "non solum per concordiam voluntatis, sed per naturam"). For how, he asks, could it be otherwise? "Nam si Verbum caro factum est, et nos vere Verbum carnem in cibo dominico sumimus: quomodo Christus in nobis manere *naturaliter* jure non æstimatur, qui et naturam carnis nostræ inseparabilem sibi homo natus Deus assumpsit, et naturam carnis suæ ad naturam æternitatis sub sacramento hoc nobis communicandæ carnis admiscuit?" Ratramn, on the other hand, denies that the bread and wine are the Body and Blood otherwise than as a *pledge* and an *image*. And, let it be carefully observed,

not, as some would wish such language to be understood, a pledge and image of a thing *present*, but of a thing *absent* and to come: c. 86, "apparet quod hoc Corpus et Sanguis pignus et imago rei sunt *futurae*." And c. 87, "Qua de re et Corpus Christi, et Sanguis est quod Ecclesia celebrat, sed tanquam imago. Veritas vero erit, cum jam nec pignus nec imago, sed ipsius rei veritas apparebit." It seems impossible to say that this is a difference of views which only relates to the "mode of manifestation or existence of the same Body:" as if both admitted the same body to be present, only in different modes: unless it might be truly said, that the whole difference between a portrait and its original consists in the "mode of manifestation or existence of the same" person.

The intrinsic importance of the difference is another matter, which cannot at all affect its nature or reality. And as Paschasius and Ratramn no doubt frequently communicated at the same altar, so, notwithstanding the wide divergency of their opinions, they may have done so with equal benefit to themselves. But the consequences of their dispute were not of slight moment, and are seen and felt at this day. Paschasius contributed more than any individual before Lanfranc to the preponderance of that belief which became the dogma of Transubstantiation. Ratramn's treatise, as is well known, exercised a most powerful influence on the mind of Ridley, and was thus mainly instrumental in fixing the doctrine of the Church of England on the Eucharist, or rather in restoring that of the Anglo-Saxon Church, as expounded, in exact conformity to the ideas, and partly in the very words of Ratramn, by Ælfric in the Paschal Homily, where he teaches: "This mystery is a pledge and a symbol; Christ's body is truth. This pledge we hold mystically, until we come to the truth, and then will this pledge be ended" (Mr. Thorpe's translation, vol. ii. p. 273, in the publication of the Ælfric Society). Most justly therefore did Canon Hopkins observe (in the Dissertation prefixed to his edition of the Treatise, ed. 1688, ch. v. p. 105) that "the doctrine of Ratramn was the very same doctrine which the Church of England embraced as most consonant to Scripture and the Fathers. Which is not what our adversaries would put upon us, that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is a

naked Commemoration of our Saviour's Death, and a mere Sign of his Body and Blood, but an efficacious Mystery, accompanied with such a Divine and Spiritual Power, as renders the consecrated Elements truly, tho' Mystically, Christ's Body and Blood, and communicates to us the real Fruits, and saving Benefits of his bitter Passion. And this is the Doctrine of Bertram, in both parts of his work."

Mr. Freeman also asserts—though with an appearance of some misgiving—that before the eleventh century, "no writer perhaps came forward to vindicate in a special manner that (side of the mystery) which had been selected by Paschasius." This supposed silence would indeed be favourable to Mr. Freeman's hypothesis. But the fact is far otherwise. The views of Paschasius were strenuously enforced by several eminent writers of the ninth and tenth centuries. Hincmar, in his twelfth Letter to Charles the Bald, asks (tom. ii. p. 100, ed. Par. 1645): "Si valuit sermo Heliae ut ignem de cælo deponeret, non valebit Christi sermo, ut species mutet elementorum? Sermo Christi qui potuit ex nihilo facere quod non erat, non potuit quæ sunt in id mutare quod non erant? Non enim minus est, novas dare res, quam mutare naturas." Haimo (in D'Achery, Spic. ed. ii. 1, p. 42), "Credimus et fideliter confitemur et tenemus quod per operationem divinæ virtutis, natura panis et vini substantialiter convertantur in aliam substantiam, id est, in carnem et sanguinem . . . In quo quidem Christi corpore et sanguine, propter sumentium honorem, sapor panis et vini remanet et figura, substantiarum natura in Corpus Christi et Sanguinem omnino conversa." Ratherius of Verona (ibid. p. 376), "Crede, frater, quia sicut in Cana Galilææ vinum Dei imperio verum et non figurativum fuit ex aqua factum, ita istud Dei benedictione vinum verus et non figurativus efficitur sanguis, et caro panis." And he goes on to compare this change to that by which at the creation the dust of the earth, though its substance remained, was transfigured into human flesh. "Ita ergo et hic manente colore, atque sapore, eadem sapientia operante, veram carnem et sanguinem quod percipis esse crede; sicut e contra mutata hominis specie hominis creatione, limi tamen substantiam manere non diffiteris." But he discourages any curious speculations as to the precise mode of the change, as, "si panis forsitan

invisibiliter sublatus, aut ipse panis in carnem mutatus." No exegetical artifices, I think, can reconcile the doctrine laid down in these passages with that of Ratramn.

But widely as Ratramn differs from Paschasius, I believe they would have agreed in rejecting Mr. Freeman's view, as far more at variance with both of theirs, than either of them with the other. Mr. Freeman's "account" of that which takes place in the Eucharist is this (p. 154): "The natural body of Christ once slain, and no longer to be accounted as Christ by reason of the separation of It from his Human Soul, was nevertheless, after being duly received into the receptacle of God's appointing, the heart of the Earth, re-united to That Soul by the operation of the interposed Divinity; and so CHRIST HIMSELF was once more truly alive, and rose again. And even so, when His Body and Blood, existing in a new and specially provided manner, have been received into the duly qualified bodies and souls of men, does the same vital re-union, as it should seem, take place, and so CHRIST HIMSELF, in Body, Soul and Divinity, is in them of truth, and raises them, together with Himself, to a glorious immortality."

I lament to see such a hypothesis proposed in a work which is in any way entitled to respectful notice. It may be said that it is a harmless speculation, which, however new, singular, and fantastical, does not exceed the bounds of that liberty which the Church allows. It may be so. But I cannot regard the diffusion of such a speculation as harmless. It must tend to infect the Church with a false unhealthy mysticism, which, as far as it spreads, will corrupt the character of her theology, weaken and pervert the minds which may be leavened with it, destroy their faculty of sober judgment, and prepare them for the reception of the wildest dreams that may spring up in disordered brains, as "high Catholic teaching."

THE END.





